

THE  
LANCASHIRE & YORKSHIRE ACCIDENT  
INSURANCE COMPANY, LTD.

HEAD OFFICE: 30, BROWN STREET, MANCHESTER.

Established 1877.

Capital, £200,000.

This COMPANY'S GUARANTEE BONDS are accepted by H.M. COURTS OF CHANCERY and BOARD OF TRADE, and by all Departments of H.M. Government.

MORTGAGE and DEBENTURE INSURANCE.

The "CLIMAX" POLICY of the Company provides against ACCIDENTS—ILLNESS—PERMANENT DISABLEMENT, &c. Capital Sums Assured under the Policy are added to annually under a CUMULATIVE BONUS SCHEME.

Policies are also issued indemnifying Employers in relation to the Workmen's Compensation Acts, 1897-1900, the Employers' Liability Act, 1880, and at Common Law, and Public Liability (Third Party) Risks.

R. KENNEDY MITCHELL, Manager and Secretary.

LAW REVERSIONARY INTEREST  
SOCIETY, LIMITED.

THANET HOUSE, 231-232, STRAND LONDON, W.C.

(OPPOSITE THE LAW COURTS).

REMOVED FROM No. 24, LINCOLN'S INN FIELDS, W.C.

ESTABLISHED 1853.

Capital Stock ... .. £400,000

Debenture Stock ... .. £278,130

REVERSIONS BOUGHT. LOANS MADE THEREON.

Proposal Forms and full information may be had at the Society's Office.  
W. OSCAR NASH, F.I.A., Actuary and Secretary.

IMPORTANT TO SOLICITORS

In Drawing LEASES or MORTGAGES of  
LICENSED PROPERTY  
To see that the Insurance Covenants include a policy covering the risk of  
LOSS OR FORFEITURE OF THE LICENSE.

Suitable clauses, settled by Counsel, can be obtained on application to  
THE LICENSES INSURANCE CORPORATION AND  
GUARANTEE FUND, LIMITED,  
24, MOORGATE STREET, LONDON, E.C.

Mortgages on Licensed Properties Guaranteed promptly.

LEGAL AND GENERAL LIFE ASSURANCE  
SOCIETY.

ESTABLISHED 1836.

10, FLEET STREET, LONDON.

FREE,  
SIMPLE,

THE  
PERFECTED  
OF  
LIFE  
ASSURANCE.

AND  
SECURE.

FUNDS - - - - - £4,700,000. INCOME - - - - - £610,000.  
YEARLY BUSINESS - - - - - £2,594,000. BUSINESS IN FORCE - £18,000,000.

TRUSTEES.

The Right Hon. The Earl of Halsbury.  
The Hon. Mr. Justice KEENEWICH.  
His Honour Judge BACON.  
WILLIAM WILLIAMS, Esq.  
RICHARD PENNINGTON, Esq., J.P.

DIRECTORS.

Bacon, His Honour Judge.  
Beggallay, Claude, Esq., K.C.  
Davey, The Right Hon. Lord.  
Deane, The Hon. Mr. Justice.  
Ellis-Danvers, Edmund Henry, Esq.  
Finch, Arthur J., Esq.  
Frere, Geo. Edgar, Esq.  
Healey, C. E. H. Chadwyck, Esq., C.B., K.C.  
Johnson, Charles P., Esq.  
Kekewich, The Hon. Mr. Justice.

Masterman, Henry Chauncy, Esq.  
Mathew, The Right Hon. Sir J. C.  
Meek, A. Grant, Esq., J.P. (Devizes).  
Mellor, The Right Hon. John W., K.C.  
Morell, Frederic P., Esq. (Oxford).  
Pennington, Richard, Esq., J.P.  
Rawle, Thomas, Esq.  
Saltwell, Wm. Henry, Esq.  
Tweedie, R. W., Esq.  
Williams, Romer, Esq., J.P., D.L.  
Williams, William, Esq.

VOL. L., No. 27.

The Solicitors' Journal.

LONDON, MAY 5, 1906.

\* The Editor cannot undertake to return rejected contributions, and copies should be kept of all articles sent by writers who are not on the regular staff of the JOURNAL.

All letters intended for publication in the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL must be authenticated by the name of the writer.

Contents.

CURRENT TOPICS .....	433	LEGAL NEWS .....	445
TRANSFERS OF SHARES .....	438	COURT PAPERS .....	449
REVIEWS .....	437	WINDING-UP NOTICES .....	452
CORRESPONDENCE .....	438	CREDITORS' NOTICES .....	453
SOCIETIES .....	442	BANKRUPTCY NOTICES .....	453
LAW STUDENTS' JOURNAL .....	447		

Cases Reported this Week.

In the Solicitors' Journal.

Attorney-General v. Corporation of	
Dorchester .....	438
Bradshaw, Re. Bradshaw v. Bradshaw	439
Curtis v. Skinner .....	441
Dartford Brewery Co. v. Quarter	
Sessions of Middlesex .....	441
Ecclesiastical Commissioners for Eng-	
land v. Durham Rural District	
Council .....	439
Golden v. Hythe Rural Board .....	439
James Scott Duckers and of the Legal	
Practitioners Act, 1878, In the	
Master of .....	441
Rivewright v. Allen .....	440
The King v. Linneker .....	440

In the Weekly Reporter.

Biagood v. Nile Valley Co. (Limited)...	397
Bullen v. Ward .....	411
Compan's Naviera Vascongada v.	
Churchill & Sim. Compania Naviera	
Vascongada v. Turton & Co. ....	404
London County Council v. Cook .....	403
Mayor, &c., of Wednesbury v. Lodge	
Holes 1935 Colliery Co. ....	412
Nicholls v. Malins .....	404
Rex v. Lloyd. Ex parte Day .....	410
Rex v. Somers and Others .....	402
Valpy, In re. Valpy v. Valpy .....	401

Current Topics.

The New Scheme of the Land Registry.

THE LEGAL event of the week has been the announcement of the fresh enterprise undertaken by the Land Registry. Apparently despairing of success at present in extending their scheme in England, having regard to the results of the experimental trial in London, the office has bethought itself of a land well supplied with deed registries, and the inhabitants of which, as we all know, have some dislike to seeing "saxpences gae bang" in useless legal expenses. We presume, therefore, that some ingenious plan has been prepared whereby it will be shewn (on paper) that a system of registration of title can be substituted for the present system of registration of deeds at rather less cost to the landowners. At all events a Royal Commission has been appointed "to inquire and report upon the expediency of instituting in Scotland a system of registration of title." It will be observed that no reference is made to the institution of a system of compulsory registration of title. The chairman of the commission is the Lord President of the Court of Session, and among the members are Mr. BRICKDALE, three Scottish solicitors, one advocate, and two other persons representing, we suppose, landowners. It is to be hoped that a few London solicitors and bankers will be called as witnesses, but we have no great hope of this. It is a thousand pities that the happy thought of going to Scotland with their system did not occur to the authorities before they fixed on London!

The Meeting of the Law Society.

THERE WAS AN unusual amount of business before the meeting of the Law Society on Friday in last week, but the most important matter was the statement of the President as to the policy of the Council with regard to the Public Trustee Bill. He said, in effect, that the Lord Chancellor had shewn every desire to hear and consider, although he had not altogether met, the views of the Council with respect to it, and they might rest assured that the Lord Chancellor was proceeding in no hostile spirit to solicitors, but merely desired better to secure and safeguard trust funds. The Council had endeavoured to point out to him that the establishment of a public trustee would be unnecessary, would tend to the expenditure of large sums of money

unnecessarily, and would be of no use or public benefit, but rather the reverse. The Bill contained clauses authorizing the appointment of custodian trustees and the audit of trust accounts. For this idea the Council were responsible, but they desired to see the clauses amended in several particulars; and as to the appointment of a Public Trustee with administrative powers, the Council associated themselves with the bankers and other branches of the mercantile community, and were bound to offer to the proposal their strenuous opposition. We believe that these remarks will receive the general approval of the profession, and that the Council will be given full credit for the important modifications which they have already succeeded in getting introduced in the Bill. Let them persevere in their opposition to the establishment of a Public Trustee with administrative powers, and it may be that the Bill will ultimately become a reasonable and satisfactory measure.

#### Election Petitions in the Reign of George the Fourth.

THE NEWSPAPERS, after an interval of some years, have begun their reports of the trial of election petitions in which the interesting topics of bribery, treating, and agency are fully considered. Election petitions are tedious and expensive, and appear to be rarely, if ever, of any benefit to the party presenting the petition. But whatever may be the objections to the present procedure, there is good ground for affirming that they are as nothing compared with those connected with an election petition in the memory of those still living. The late Mr. SAMUEL WARREN, who, as the author of a Manual on Parliamentary Election Law, may be supposed to have known something of the constitution of election committees, describes, in his novel of "Ten Thousand a Year," how thirty-three members were drawn by lot, and how eleven names were struck off by each party alternately, so as to reduce the whole number to eleven, who composed the committee. The party who secured the odd member had practically secured the casting vote, and when the petition was called on, its fate was already as good as decided. The members who were in the majority paid no attention to the evidence, being busy with their betting books, or in writing franks. In the result, the Yatton petition, described by Mr. WARREN, was dismissed as frivolous and vexatious, and the petitioner was ordered to pay the costs, though bribery and treating were scarcely disputed and the evidence of agency was overwhelming. The counsel for the petitioner contrasts this outrageous decision with that of another committee who had recently held that a man who once stood under a doorway with the sitting member in a sudden shower of rain had thereby become his agent. Sir ALEXANDER COCKBURN, in one of his eloquent letters, vigorously criticized the legislation which required the judges of the superior courts to sit on the trial of election petitions, but no one is bold enough to suggest that they are the representatives of political parties.

#### Contumacy in Criminal Procedure.

A REPORT of the trial and sentence of a man *par contumace* who was charged with stealing a valuable book from one of the public libraries in Paris will not be easily understood by those who are only familiar with the criminal procedure of England. Punishment for contumacy, or the persistence in refusing to appear in answer to a formal summons from a criminal court, was not tolerated by the Roman law, at any rate where the punishment for the original offence was capital; but in France, according to ancient usage, the accused person was liable to be found guilty *par contumace* and sentenced to death or the galleys, as the case might be. The procedure is now regulated by certain sections of the Code d'Instruction Criminelle, which enable the accused person to be sentenced in his absence without the intervention of a jury and without counsel being heard on his behalf. The only trace of a similar procedure in English law is to be found in the process of outlawry. Where an indictment for treason, felony, or misdemeanour has been found by a grand jury against any person, and summary process proves ineffectual for the apprehension of the defendant, process of outlawry is issued—outlawry being a punishment inflicted upon an offender by the law for contumacy in refusing to render

himself amenable to the justice of the King's courts. This outlawry was equivalent to a conviction, and punishment might follow whether the man outlawed was innocent of the crime or not. In the last edition of Archbold the law of outlawry is said to be almost extinct, and it seems probable that the procedure *par contumace* will before long be discontinued in France. In both cases the procedure seems wholly opposed to the maxim that a man shall not be condemned unheard.

#### The English Law of Divorce and Separation.

THE CONSIDERED judgment of the President of the Divorce Division in *Dodd v. Dodd* has caused some discussion in the newspapers as to the present state of the matrimonial laws, and this discussion has travelled over rather a wide field. The material question which the learned judge was called upon to decide was whether a husband, who had lived separately and apart from his wife for two years and upwards after she had obtained a separation order against him under the Summary Jurisdiction (Married Women) Act, 1895, had been guilty of desertion, so as to entitle the wife, upon proof that he had committed adultery, to obtain a divorce. The learned judge examined the Act and the Matrimonial Causes Acts with great care and at considerable length, and came to the conclusion that the absence of the husband under the separation order did not constitute desertion, and that the petition for divorce must be dismissed. Sir GORELL BARNES, however, enters into the general consideration of the effect of these orders, and starting from the fact that it is shown by statistics that their number has enormously increased, he gives it as his opinion that the result of the Act has been to cause women in numerous cases to rush off to the magistrates on slight provocation and to endeavour to make a case sufficient to obtain an order. After expressing his doubt whether these summary proceedings are suitable for the determination of matters which affect the future life of the parties and their children, he proceeds to discuss the whole subject of judicial separations as distinct from divorce, and says that the direct tendency of these orders appears to be to encourage immorality and to produce deplorable results. The question is one of considerable difficulty. A court of summary jurisdiction may be, in some respects, a defective tribunal, but it is not likely that the Legislature will repeal the Act of 1895 and compel the poorer sort of people to seek their remedy in the superior court. In the case of the drunken husband who does no work and lives upon his wife's earnings—which, we are afraid, is a very common one—we can see little advantage in refusing relief to the wife. The Act has been in operation for some years, and the opinion of the magistrates who have been entrusted with the execution of its powers, as to whether it should be amended, would be of considerable value.

#### Breach of Promise in France.

WE HEAR that in the list of causes for trial in the King's Bench Division there are an unusual number of actions for breach of promise of marriage. A judgment which has just been given by the Third Chamber of the Tribunal of the Seine is a good illustration of the strict limits which are placed upon a claim for damages in such an action by the French courts. It appeared that after the parents of the plaintiff had given their consent to her marriage with the defendant, the banns were published and the date for the ceremony was fixed. A telegram was, however, sent by the defendant to the plaintiff, on the day before that appointed for the marriage, saying that it must be broken off. The particulars of the plaintiff's claim in the action consisted of an account of expenses incurred in anticipation of the marriage and a further claim of 5,000 francs as damages for the mental suffering which she had undergone through the breach of the contract. The judgment of the court recites that, according to sound principle, an action cannot be brought to recover damages for breach of promise of marriage, but that, under article 1382 of the Code, relating to wrongs independent of contract, the defendant was responsible in damages for the act done by him causing injury to the plaintiff. He was, therefore, liable to indemnify the plaintiff for all the expenses which had been rendered useless by his act in suddenly and capriciously, and at the last moment, breaking off the marriage. No objection could be made to the account of expenses incurred by the plaintiff,

but with regard to the claim for damages for mental distress, it could not be entertained, for, conceding that the plaintiff had suffered some pain from her affections having been trifled with by the defendant, her escape from a marriage which was not likely to be a happy one gave her no cause for complaint. We have heard this last proposition maintained by counsel for the defendant at the trial of similar actions in this country. It is not, however, regarded with much favour by either judge or jury, and is open to the obvious objection that it would enable the defendant to profit by his own misconduct.

#### Suing for Costs Within the Month.

THE AMENDMENT by the Legal Practitioners Act, 1875, of section 37 of the Solicitors Act, 1843, does not appear to have hitherto furnished any reported decision, and interest therefore attaches to the recent case before SUTTON, J., in chambers, of which a report is given elsewhere. Section 37, as is well known, precludes a solicitor from commencing an action for the recovery of his costs until the expiration of one month after delivery of his bill, but such delay may, under certain circumstances, deprive him of the fruits of his remedy altogether, and hence the Act of 1875 allows a relaxation where "there is probable cause for believing that the party chargeable therewith is about to quit England or to become a bankrupt or a liquidating or compounding debtor, or to take any other steps or do any other act which in the opinion of the judge, would tend to defeat or delay" the solicitor in obtaining payment. The judge here referred to is a judge of the High Court, and when it is desired to take advantage of the Act it is necessary to make application in the High Court. Upon proof that the case falls within the section, the judge may authorize the solicitor to commence an action or suit for the recovery of his fees, and may refer the bill for taxation, although the month required by section 37 of the Act of 1843 has not expired. But the Act of 1875 does not say whether the proceedings so authorized must be in the High Court, or whether they may be in any court which would have jurisdiction after the statutory period. Upon principle, the latter view seems to be correct. The function of the High Court is to dispense with the statutory period, and thereupon the solicitor is relegated to his ordinary remedies as though the restriction of section 37 did not exist. In the present case the application was originally made to the Mayor's Court for permission to sue there for costs within a month of delivery of the bill, but the words of the Act seem to exclude applications to an inferior court, and so it was held. The application was then made to, and allowed by, SUTTON, J., but that learned judge did not feel called upon to decide further whether the proceedings authorized by his order might be in the Mayor's Court. This is the course which the plaintiff seems to have decided on, and it would be an unnecessarily restricted construction of the Act to deny him this remedy.

#### Appointment by a Person of Himself as Trustee.

WHERE a person is the donee of a power of appointing new trustees, it is difficult to see how there can be any necessary invalidity in the appointment by the donee of himself to be a new trustee. It has been suggested that, as no one can be judge in his own case, such an appointment would be open to objection (Lewin on Trusts, 10th ed., p. 788), and in *Re Newen* (1894, 2 Ch. 297) KEKEWICH, J., expressed the opinion that no trustee having a fiduciary power of appointing a trustee could exercise that power by appointing himself, either alone or together with any other person. But a trusteeship is not an office of profit, and if such an appointment is made, the reason is likely to be that the appointee is really the most suitable person for the post. In *Montefiore v. Guedalla* (52 W. R. 151; 1903, 2 Ch. 723), accordingly, BUCKLEY, J., held that four executors of a will, who had the power of appointing new trustees of the will, could appoint one of themselves to be a trustee. Persons having the power of appointment could, he said, when the language of the instrument creating the power allowed them to do so, appoint one of themselves, but such an appointment ought only to be made in exceptional circumstances. It usually happens, however, that the power refers to the appointment of some "other" person to be trustee in such a way as to

exclude the donee from appointing himself, and this was so in *Re Skeats' Settlement* (42 Ch. D. 522) and *Re Newen* (*supra*). And in the recent case of *Re Sampson* (1906, 1 Ch. 435) it has been held that such an appointment is precluded by the terms of section 10 (1) of the Trustee Act, 1893, when the appointment is made under that section. The power is for the persons nominated by the trust instrument, or for the surviving or continuing trustees, or the personal representatives of the last such trustee, to appoint "another person or other persons." It was argued that these words were used in correlation, not to the person exercising the power, but to the person in place of whom the new trustee is to be appointed, but KEKEWICH, J., declined to admit this construction and held that an appointment under this section by the donee of the power was necessarily bad.

#### A Vendor's Right to Rescind for Objection to Title.

AN IMPORTANT pronouncement upon the circumstances under which a vendor can exercise his right to rescind upon the purchaser insisting on an objection to title has been given by the Court of Appeal in *Re Jackson and Haden's Contract* (1906, 1 Ch. 412). In that case the vendors had contracted to sell a house by a description wide enough to include the minerals under it. The contract provided, by clause 13, that the vendors might rescind if the purchaser should insist on any objection or requisition as to title which the vendors should be unable or should decline to comply with, and, by clause 14, that any error or misstatement should form the subject of compensation. The abstract shewed that the minerals had been reserved upon a grant to predecessors in title of the vendors, and the vendors believed it to be well known in the district that such reservation was usual. As a matter of fact, the purchaser did not know this, and he insisted on delivery of a supplemental abstract of title to the minerals. Thereupon, the vendors gave notice to rescind under clause 13. BUCKLEY, J., decided in favour of the purchaser on the ground that, in respect of the minerals, the vendors had no title, and hence that, in accordance with the principle of *Bowman v. Hyland* (8 Ch. D. 588), the condition did not apply. But the Court of Appeal have found a difficulty in holding that *Bowman v. Hyland*, where the vendor had no title at all, covers a case where the vendor has no title to a part of the property only; and they have affirmed the decision of BUCKLEY, J., on the broader ground that the vendor cannot avail himself of such a condition when he has failed in his duty towards the purchaser—a duty which was defined by the Master of the Rolls in the following terms: "There must be a falling short on his part—he must have done less than an ordinarily prudent man, having regard to his relations to another person, when dealing with him, is bound to do; and therefore where, knowing the exact facts, he has recklessly made a description of them which would mislead another person who did not know as much as himself (even though he thought that person might know as much as himself), there is a clear failure of duty on the part of the vendor which fairly disentitles him to say that a clause introduced into the contract for his benefit is introduced to meet such a case as that which has arisen here, namely, a reckless disregard by the vendor of his duty as to accuracy of statement when he is making a statement with a view to other persons acting upon it as correct." The omission to state the facts as to the minerals was such a misstatement, and accordingly disentitled the vendor to rescind, while, on the other hand, clause 14 required him to allow compensation. It is obvious that, in the interest of vendors, great care and accuracy should be employed so as to insure the exact state of the property being disclosed by the conditions of sale.

#### Sales Under the Direction of the Court.

A FURTHER example of the refusal by the court to allow a vendor to exercise his right of rescission is afforded by the recent decision of KEKEWICH, J., in *Hollisell v. Seacombe* (1906, 1 Ch. 426). There land was sold under the direction of the court subject to a condition that if any purchaser should take any objection or make any requisition which the vendors were advised not to remove or comply with, the vendors should, with the sanction of the judge, be at liberty to rescind the contract upon such terms as the judge should approve, and thereupon the

purchaser was to accept the return of the deposit in discharge of all claims for costs or otherwise. The property was described in the particulars as "valuable freehold land . . . immediately ripe for development as a building estate." In fact it was subject to a restrictive covenant which, if enforced, would prevent its development in this way; and the purchaser took out a summons to be discharged from his purchase, and to be allowed his costs in addition to the return of his deposit. The vendors applied for leave to rescind. Ordinarily a purchaser, upon the contract going off through default of the vendor, is entitled only to the costs of investigating the title, but on a sale by or under the direction of the court a higher standard is imposed, and the purchaser is entitled also to his costs of bidding at the sale. On the other hand, the vendors contended that under the conditions they were entitled to rescind and get rid of all claims by the purchaser by returning his deposit, unless, indeed, the judge made it a term of giving leave that any costs should be paid to him. As to the right of rescission, however, there was the point that the vendors had made a misrepresentation, and that such conduct excluded their having recourse to rescission. Upon this *KEKEWICH, J.*, relied upon the rule laid down in *Re Terry and White's Contract* (32 Ch. D. 14), which is now reinforced by *Re Jackson and Haden's Contract*, referred to above, and held that the right of rescission could not be exercised. There had been a direct representation that the ground could be used for building, when, in fact, to the knowledge of the vendors, it could not be so used. If, however, it had been exercisable, the learned judge held that the terms, to be approved by the judge, concerned only the persons interested as vendors, and that the rescission, so far as concerned the purchaser, would have been subject solely to the conditions—that is, the purchaser would have got back his deposit, but no costs. But under the circumstances the rescission clause did not apply, and since the purchaser was discharged from his purchase by the court, he got back his deposit and was also allowed his full costs, including the costs of bidding at the sale.

#### Attempt to Commit a Crime.

THE QUESTION what amounts to an attempt to commit a crime comes up for decision frequently, and was before the Court for the Consideration of Crown Cases Reserved again last week in the case of *Re v. Linneker*. The prisoner was indicted under sections 14 and 18 of the Offences Against the Person Act, 1861, under each of which sections it is an offence "by drawing a trigger or in any other manner" to attempt to discharge a loaded firearm against any person. The evidence shewed that he had taken a revolver from his pocket with the intention of shooting the prosecutor, but had been seized and disarmed before he could even present it or raise his arm. The court held that in these circumstances he was rightly convicted of having attempted to commit the alleged offence. The difficulty in these cases of firearms arises from the use of the words "by drawing a trigger or in any other manner" and from the interpretation put upon them by *PARK, B.*, in the case of *Reg. v. St. George* (9 C. & P. 483). He held that "or in any other manner" meant in some manner *eiusdem generis* with pulling a trigger—*e.g.*, by striking a percussion cap with a hammer. This very narrow construction, however, after giving trouble for many years, was expressly overruled by *Reg. v. Duckworth* (40 W. R. 448; 1892, 2 Q. B. 83), and it is about time that the case should be forgotten, as it has probably led to the discharge of many persons who caught up guns or drew pistols against others but were stopped before they could actually present them or place a finger on a trigger. As the law stands at present, there must continue to be difficult questions as to attempt. According to *Stephen's Digest of the Criminal Law*, "an attempt to commit a crime is an act done with intent to commit a crime, and forming part of a series of acts which would constitute its actual commission if it were not interrupted." The difficulty in practice often lies in deciding whether an alleged act approximates to the commission of the offence sufficiently directly to form part of the series. Thus, it has been held that where a man strikes a match close to a hay-stack with intent to set it on fire, but blows it out on perceiving that he is watched, he is guilty of an attempt to set fire to the stack; whereas if he goes no farther than procuring a box

of matches with intent to commit the offence, he has made no attempt: *R. v. Taylor* (1 F. & F. 511). The mere intention is, of course, no offence, but when any overt act is done in furtherance of the intention the doer of such act ought to be held responsible, even although the act is not sufficiently proximate to constitute an attempt. It may be said that the difficulty lies in distinguishing between an act of preparation to commit a crime and an act intended to lead directly to the crime. It is submitted that an act of preparation should be regarded as an offence. Where such an act is clearly done with a guilty intention (for instance, the mere buying of poison, or taking the impression of a key), the person has done more than form an intention; he has acted in pursuance of that intention, and should be made amenable to the law. This opinion, however, is not consistent with the existing state of the law as laid down in decided cases.

#### The Business of the London Sessions.

THE TIME of the Quarter Sessions for the County of London has for some years been largely occupied by appeals against valuation lists for the different parishes, and a heavy addition to their labours has, since the passing of the Licensing Act, 1904, been made by requiring them to assess the compensation payable to persons interested in licensed premises on the refusal of the renewal of the existing licences. In many of these cases the facts are complicated, and the amount in dispute is far beyond anything to which litigants are accustomed in the High Court. It is, however, notorious that the time allotted for the determination of these cases is wholly inadequate, and that the court can only get through its lists by persuading the parties in some of the most difficult matters to agree upon a settlement. It is, unfortunately, easier to recognize the evil than to suggest a remedy for it.

#### The Judges' Portraits in the Guildhall.

IN AN article in *Blackwood's Magazine*, called the "The Early Royal Academy," we are told the story of the judges' portraits in the Guildhall. The painting of these portraits had been assigned by the Corporation to Sir PETER LELY, but when he came to carry it out, he considered that it was beneath his dignity to attend upon the judges in their chambers, and so the commission was transferred to MICHAEL WRIGHT. An interesting selection might be made and published of engravings from the portraits of some of our more eminent judges. The portraits of MANSFIELD, LOUGHBOROUGH, and ERSKINE should certainly be included in the list.

### Transfers of Shares.

A DECISION of considerable importance with reference to dealings in shares by way of security has been given by the Court of Appeal in *Hooper v. Herts* (54 W. R. 350; 1906, 1 Ch. 549) on appeal from the judgment of *KEKEWICH, J.* Two persons, WHATTON and HERTS, had had financial transactions with each other, and in the course of these it was desired that money should be raised from an outside source. WHATTON had 1,467 shares in the Smelting and Refining Co. of Australia, and he handed to HERTS a transfer in blank of these shares, together with the certificate, in order that they should be used as security. At first HERTS raised some small sums on the shares from HOOPER, but WHATTON desired to have a substantial sum raised, and he wrote a letter in which he urged HERTS not to postpone the matter, and observed that it ought to be possible to borrow on the shares up to a good value at 4 per cent. Thereupon HERTS applied to HOOPER for an advance of £700, and HOOPER, not having the money available, arranged to obtain it on loan to himself from the Mines and Banking Corporation. HERTS accordingly authorized HOOPER by letter to raise the £700 at 10 per cent., and to deduct from this amount the advances previously made by HOOPER. HOOPER thereupon carried out the transaction with the corporation, handing them the blank transfer and share certificate, and he received from them £700. This was handed to HERTS, and the existing advances were repaid by HERTS out of it, and HERTS gave a receipt in which he stated the understanding to be that the advance was to be repaid in fifteen

days or that the shares might be transferred to the corporation or their nominee, and in the event of a sale being effected, any deficiency was to be made good by him.

The above transactions took place in January, 1904, and on the 25th of March in that year, the loan having been repaid neither by HOOPER nor by HERTS, the corporation, with HOOPER's assent, inserted his name in the blank transfer. It was then executed by HOOPER, and, with the certificate, lodged by the corporation at the office of the Smelting and Refining Co. of Australia for registration. No question seems to have arisen as to the filling in of the blank after execution by the transferor, and it is to be inferred that WHATTON had transferred under hand only, and not under seal, though this does not appear to be expressly stated in the reports. But upon WHATTON receiving the usual notice from the company that the transfer had been lodged for registration, he replied that the transfer was not in order and should not be completed, and the company thereupon declined to proceed with the registration. Subsequently the shares fell greatly in value, and became practically unsaleable. In April, 1904, HOOPER commenced an action against HERTS and WHATTON, claiming against HERTS repayment of the £700 and interest, and against WHATTON a declaration of charge on the shares. The claim against WHATTON was subsequently amended by alleging that that defendant was under an implied obligation not to do anything to prevent or delay the registration of a *bonâ fide* transferee for value of the shares, and that he had broken the implied obligation, and damages were claimed under this head. HERTS was adjudicated bankrupt soon after the commencement of the action, and in August, 1904, HOOPER paid off the corporation. WHATTON's defence was that HERTS had raised the £700 without his authority, the actual authority which he gave having been subject to conditions which had not been satisfied. But this defence, of course, could not avail as against third parties, and KEKEWICH, J., held that, since WHATTON entrusted the documents of title with HERTS for the purpose of raising money and had given no notice of any limitations on this authority to third parties, he must be taken to have authorized the raising of the £700. But there remained the two technical points, whether the alleged obligation existed, and, if so, whether, under the circumstances, HOOPER was in a position to claim damages for breach of it. On the first point KEKEWICH, J., was in the plaintiff's favour, but upon the second he held that the plaintiff's case failed. At the commencement of the action he had not paid off the corporation, and was not in a position to have realized the shares for his own benefit. Hence, it was said, he had suffered no damage. The Court of Appeal have agreed as to the existence of the obligation on a transferor not to prevent the registration of the shares which he has transferred, but they have differed from the learned judge as to the right of HOOPER to get damages, and since, of course, he was in fact the person who ultimately suffered, it is satisfactory that the technical objection has been overcome.

Upon the question of the obligation of a transferor not to interfere with the completion of the transfer the case follows out the suggestion made by Lord ESHER, M.R., in *London Founders' Association v. Clarke* (36 W. R. 489, 20 Q. B. D. 576). There the registration was prevented, not by any action of the transferor, but by the directors refusing to register the transfer under the powers of the articles of association. It was held that the contract for the sale of shares did not import an undertaking by the vendor that the company would register the transferee, and the money paid for the shares was not recoverable. But, on the other hand, such a case as that which has now arisen was expressly excluded. "I have no doubt," said Lord ESHER, M.R., "that the seller must not prevent or do anything to prevent the company from accepting the purchaser or his nominee. What the remedy would be, if he did, it is unnecessary now to consider." And in pursuance of this the Court of Appeal have now affirmed this duty on the transferor, and have held that the remedy is in damages for breach of the duty. "The transfer itself," says COLLINS, M.R., "contains the grant by which the relation between the parties of grantor and grantee is created, and that carries with it an obligation, as it seems to me, on the part of the grantor not to interfere with the full fruition by the grantee

of that which the grantor has purported to give him under the grant. That seems to me enough to establish the obligation, and the breach of it is not denied."

On the question of the right of HOOPER to recover damages for this breach of obligation, it is not altogether easy to appreciate the difficulty felt by KEKEWICH, J., in allowing him redress. Even before he repaid the £700 to the Mines and Banking Corporation, he was the person who was really prejudiced by the delay in registering the shares. True, the corporation were prejudiced as well, since they had a right to rely upon the shares as security, but they had also the additional security of HOOPER's liability, whilst he, for practical purposes, had only the shares. Moreover, at this time, while he was substantially damaged by the impracticability of realizing the shares, he was himself the legal transferee of them. "*Prima facie*," said the Master of the Rolls, "there is a clear right in a legal transferee, who is entitled to the performance of a particular obligation, to have damages paid to him measured by the loss which he in his legal position as owner can be fairly said to have suffered by reason of the breach of that obligation." The objection of KEKEWICH, J., was that he had not, at the time, the beneficial interest in the shares, but this seems to overlook the fact that he was entitled to be secured by the shares as well as the corporation, and the Court of Appeal, looking broadly at the facts, held that HOOPER was the person really damaged. "If those shares could be realized, the realization would enure ultimately for the benefit of HOOPER, because it would reduce his obligation to the bank, if the bank took the security. If, on the other hand, he paid off the bank, then he would apply the security in mitigation, so far as it would go, of his own damages." In either case it was HOOPER who was actually interested in the shares being realized to the best advantage, and since he was also the transferee of the shares, his right to recover damages seems to be sufficiently clear. The real point in the case, COLLINS, M.R., observed, was that HOOPER was not a mere nominee, but was the person beneficially interested in the realization of the security. When this was admitted, it of course followed that he was entitled to the redress claimed, and an inquiry was directed as to the amount which the shares would have realized had they been sold, with ordinary business precaution, at the time of WHATTON's interference.

## Reviews.

### Forms of Wills.

HAYES AND JARMAN'S CONCISE FORMS OF WILLS; WITH PRACTICAL NOTES. TWELFTH EDITION. By J. B. MATTHEWS, Barrister-at-Law. Sweet & Maxwell (Limited).

Every practitioner of experience has his own favourite forms of wills, from which he seldom deviates, but even to him this work will afford hints in the exceptional cases where the caprice of a testator renders special provisions necessary. We think, however, that, while the forms the book contains are sound enough, they would be the better for a somewhat rigorous pruning and occasional rearrangement. And as the practice of paragraphing wills has now become common, and has many advantages, in the shape of enabling ready reference and omission of formal introductory words, we should be glad to see it adopted in these precedents.

The most valuable parts of the book, in our view, are the annotated copy of the Wills Act and the excellent Practical View of that Act with which it opens, and also the notes to the precedents. The notes to the Act are admirable collections of the authorities on each section, and it is very convenient to have the sections and notes placed in collocation, and the notes to the precedents are very full and well kept up to date. For many years we have found that, notwithstanding Jarman and Theobald, we have been unable to do without the present work. One can usually find in the notes a reference to all the relevant cases well grouped together, and with their effect tersely stated. The book seems to us to be a valuable one for office or chamber use, and the present edition will not diminish its reputation.

### Books of the Week.

Rates and Taxes: A Practical Guide. By E. M. KONSTAM, Barrister-at Law. Butterworth & Co.

Principles of the Law of Real Property, intended as a First Book for the Use of Students in Conveyancing. By the late JOSHUA WILLIAMS, K.C. The Twentieth Edition. Re-arranged and Partly Re-written by his Son, T. CYPRIAN WILLIAMS, LL.B., Barrister-at-Law. Sweet & Maxwell (Limited).

Kelly's Draftsman: containing a Collection of Concise Precedents and Forms in Conveyancing, with Introductory Observations and Practical Notes. Fifth Edition. By LEONARD H. WEST, LL.D., Solicitor, late Law Tutor to the Law Society, and L. B. SCOTT, Solicitor, Law Society Prizeman. Butterworth & Co.

The Trade-Marks Act, 1905 (5 Ed. 7, c. 15); with Notes upon the Sections of the Act and the Trade-Mark Rules, 1906. By LEONARD MOSSOP, B.C.L., Barrister-at-Law. Waterlow Bros. & Layton (Limited).

A Manual of Book-keeping for Solicitors, Furnishing a Complete System of Accounts for Solicitors, including the Treatment of Costs and Disbursements, and containing a Chapter Dealing with the Method of Banking Clients' Moneys Apart from Their Own. By JOHNSON M. WOODMAN, Chartered Accountant. Revised Edition. Shaw & Sons; Butterworth & Co.

Bibliotheca Legum: A Catalogue of Law Books, including all the Reports in the Various Courts of England, Ireland, and Scotland to 1865. With a Supplement of the Works Published between January, 1865, and December, 1905. By HENRY G. STEVENS and ROBERT W. HAYNES, Law Publishers and Booksellers, Foreign and Colonial Literary Agents, &c., &c. Stevens & Haynes.

## Correspondence.

### County Court Registrars.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,—I should like to emphasize your remarks anent the Council of the Bar and the extended jurisdiction of the registrar of county courts.

It must be remembered that, in the vast majority of cases, the registrar is an advocate who has attained eminence in his local court by reason of his ability and experience of court practice. The judge, in far too many cases, enters upon his duties absolutely ignorant of county court work, and owes his position to neither learning nor experience, but to a more or less distant relationship to some person who can influence in his direction the stream of judicial preferment. The alacrity with which suitors will consent to their cases being tried by the registrar shews their confidence in, and satisfaction with, that tribunal. Of course cases tried by him are heard in open court.

The way in which counsel gird at their brethren is very ungrateful, most undignified, and totally unworthy, when it is remembered that they owe their position entirely to solicitors.

Worthing, April 30.

H. H. STOCKDALE ROSS.

### Absolute Titles under the Land Transfer Acts.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,—I suppose that, one of these days, an inquiry will be held into the working of the Land Transfer Acts, and it is therefore of great importance to preserve the opinions of persons who must be regarded by everybody as being absolutely impartial.

The following remark of Mr. Eve, K.C., in the course of the argument in *Re J. W. Clark, Deceased* (54 W. R. 386) is valuable: "In this case the title is an absolute title registered at the Land Registry, but the conveyancing counsel refuse that title and insist on making investigation, thus causing greater expense."

What have the Land Registry to say of the way in which the conveyancing counsel regard their *magnum opus*? A system which has been so universally condemned would have died long ago if it had not the command of unlimited public funds and vast patronage to back it.

S.

### Income Tax on Tithe Rent-charge.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,—In reference to your correspondent "Prudens" letter in your last issue, the tithe owner is assessed directly on his tithe rent-charge, and cannot be asked to pay twice. The land owner should, in making his income tax return, deduct the tithe rent-charge from the income of the land.

7, Wrotham-road, Gravesend, May 2.

EVAN LAKE.

Sir Alfred Wills took his seat for the first time as a member of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council on Tuesday.

## Cases of the Week.

### Court of Appeal.

ATTORNEY-GENERAL v. CORPORATION OF DORCHESTER. No. 2.  
24th and 25th April.

NUISANCE—INJUNCTION—EXERCISE OF STATUTORY POWERS—LIABILITY OF LOCAL AUTHORITY.

This was an appeal by the defendants from a decision of Kekewich, J. The action was brought by the Attorney-General at the relation of Mr. R. E. Talbot and by Mr. Talbot as co-plaintiff for an injunction to restrain the defendants from carrying on certain works for the treatment and disposal of the sewage of the borough of Dorchester so as to cause a nuisance, and also for an injunction based upon section 17 of the Public Health Act, 1875, to restrain them from conveying sewage and filthy water from their sewage works into the River Frome before such sewage and filthy water had been freed from excrementitious and other foul and noxious matter affecting the purity of the water in the river. Mr. Talbot was the owner and occupier of a dwelling-house known as Syward Lodge, Dorchester. The defendants were the owners of certain works and land for the treatment and disposal of the sewage of the borough, which works were in the immediate neighbourhood of Mr. Talbot's house. It appeared that great pressure had for many years past been put upon the defendants by the Local Government Board to compel them to establish a new and extended drainage system for the borough; and ultimately by the Dorchester Order, 1900, confirmed by the Local Government Board's Provisional Orders Confirmation (No. 9) Act, 1900, provision was made for the extension of the boundaries of the borough, and by article 21 the defendant corporation were required within six months after the commencement of the order to proceed to carry out works for the disposal of the sewage of the borough approved by the Local Government Board. It was these works which were complained of in the action. Kekewich, J., found as a fact that there existed a public and private nuisance occasioned by the defendants' works, and upon the question whether such nuisance was actionable he came to the conclusion that article 21 of the Dorchester Order really meant that the defendants were within the time-limit to exercise the powers conferred on them by section 27 of the Public Health Act, 1875, and in no wise relieved them from the obligation not to commit a nuisance. His lordship declared that at the date of the writ there were both a public and a private nuisance by smell and a breach of section 17 of the Public Health Act, 1875, but that this last-named breach did not continue, and granted injunctions to restrain the defendants from carrying on their works so as to be a public nuisance to the inhabitants of the borough or a private nuisance to the plaintiff, and he also granted an inquiry as to damages; but he suspended the operation of this order pending the appeal. The defendants appealed.

THE COURT (COLLINS, M.R., and ROMER and COZENS-HARDY, L.JJ.) dismissed the appeal.

COLLINS, M.R.—It was practically admitted by counsel for the appellant that a nuisance of some kind exists—in fact they said that it was practically impossible to carry on works of this kind without creating a nuisance—but their defence is that the corporation are under a statutory obligation to execute and carry out these particular works, which have been approved by the Local Government Board, and therefore they are entitled to immunity from the consequences resulting from these works. Taking it, then, as admitted that there is a nuisance, the short point for decision is, are the corporation entitled to any protection by virtue of the Dorchester Order, 1900, which in article 21 provides that it shall be the duty of the corporation within six months after the commencement of the order to proceed to execute works for the disposal of the sewage of the borough approved by the Local Government Board, with a proviso that, in the event of the corporation not proceeding with the same within the limited period, or not proceeding with the same with due diligence, the requirements of the article might be enforced in the manner provided by section 299 of the Public Health Act, 1875? I propose first to consider the law on this subject under the Public Health Act alone. By section 15 of that Act the maintenance and the making of sewers is vested in the local authority, by section 16 the local authority have powers given for making sewers, and by section 17 sewage is to be purified before being discharged into any stream or watercourse. Section 27 authorizes the local authority for the purposes of receiving, storing, disinfecting, distributing, or otherwise disposing of sewage to construct works within their district and to enter into contracts, with this important proviso, "that no nuisance be created in the exercise of any of the powers given by this section." The next important section is 299, which empowers the Local Government Board to enforce the performance of its duties by a defaulting local authority. This particular section has been treated by the courts as not applying to any default by a local authority in supplying sewage disposal works, but as giving power only to enforce the obligations imposed by sub-section 15 and awards which I have just referred to. Consequently, taking that as the correct view of the law, the Local Government Board has no power under the Act of 1875 to enforce the performance of its duty by a defaulting local authority in respect of sewage disposal works. But the effect of the Dorchester Order, 1900, article 21, is to enable the provisions of section 299 to be applied for enforcing the performance of its duties by a local authority to provide proper sewage disposal works; in other words, article 21 applies the machinery of the Act of 1875, which is applicable to another set of sections to the works for disposal of sewage, but it in no way modifies the obligations imposed by the Act, that no nuisance is to be created, and therefore, in my opinion the obligation

upon the corporation not to commit a nuisance still remains. The appellants' contention is that they have a mandate from the Legislature to execute and carry out certain works for the disposal of their sewage in a particular way that has been approved by the Local Government Board, and that incidentally this gives them an immunity. The answer is that it is impossible to ignore the condition of the law at the time this order of 1900 was made; it behoves the appellants to shew that the particular inhibition imposed by section 27 of the Act of 1875 not to commit a nuisance has been in terms withdrawn, and this they have failed to do. The order of 1900 is in effect only a convenient way of enabling the obligations imposed by section 27 to be enforced, and supplies the means of compelling the local authority to carry out its duty properly without in any way giving any particular immunity. With regard to the contention that this is not a case because no public right is threatened, I am of opinion that what the appellants are doing is exactly within section 17 of the Public Health Act, which requires all sewage to be purified before it is passed into any stream, and if authority is needed the case of *Attorney-General v. Cokermouth Local Board* (22 W. R. 619, 18 Eq. 172) is precisely in point. The appeal therefore fails and must be dismissed with costs.

ROMER and COZENS-HARDY, L.J.J., delivered judgments to the same effect.—COUNSEL, Danckwerts, K.C., Stewart Smith, K.C., and Sargant; Macmorran, K.C., P. O. Lawrence, K.C., and Longstaffe. SOLICITORS, Chester & Co. for A. G. Symonds, Town Clerk, Dorchester; Clut on & Johnson.

[Reported by J. I. STIRLING, Esq., Barrister-at-Law.]

**Re BRADSHAW. BRADSHAW v. BRADSHAW.** No. 2. 24th April.  
PRACTICE—APPEAL—EXTENSION OF TIME—INFANT—CONFLICTING JUDICIAL DECISIONS—R. S. C. LVIII. 15.

This was an application by an infant by her guardian *ad litem* for leave to appeal from a judgment of Kekewich, J., delivered on the 22nd of January, 1902 (reported 1902, 1 Ch. 436), notwithstanding that the time limited for appealing had elapsed. The grounds of the application were (1) that the applicant was an infant; (2) that the question at issue involved a sum of £20,000; (3) that two other judges—in *Re Oliver's Settlement* (53 W. R. 215; 1905, 1 Ch. 191) and *Re Beale's Settlement* (53 W. R. 216; 1905, 1 Ch. 256)—had declined to follow Kekewich, J.'s decision; and (4) that the doubts cast upon the decision had only recently become known to the guardian *ad litem*. It appeared that the interest of the plaintiff, who was an adult, was substantially the same as that of the applicant.

THE COURT (COLLINS, M.R., and ROMER and COZENS-HARDY, L.J.J.) refused the application.

COLLINS, M.R., said that it was clear on the authorities that the circumstance that other judges had subsequently expressed views upon a question of law at variance with the decision sought to be appealed from was not in itself a ground for granting an extension of time. The discretion given to the court by ord. 58, r. 15 ought to be exercised on the principles stated by Cotton, L.J., in *Re Manchester Economic Building Society* (32 W. R. 325, 24 Ch. D. 488, 499) and leave ought not to be granted except upon very special terms. Here the applicant had been properly represented by counsel in the court below, and it would be mischievous to hold the mere fact of her infancy a ground for extending the time for appealing. There were no special circumstances which would justify the court in granting leave to appeal.

ROMER, L.J., in concurring, said that he did not regard the largeness of the amount at stake as a special circumstance for this purpose.—COUNSEL, MacSwiney; R. J. Parker; Gilbert Smith. SOLICITORS, Smith & Brettell; Kingsford & Dorman.

[Reported by J. I. STIRLING, Esq., Barrister-at-Law.]

### High Court—Chancery Division.

**GODDEN v. HYTHE BURIAL BOARD.** Kekewich, J. 30th April.  
CEMETERY—BURIAL ACT (18 & 19 VICT. c. 128)—DISTANCE OF 100 YARDS FROM DWELLING-HOUSE—INJUNCTION.

This was a motion to restrain the defendants from using that portion of a certain piece of land, as a burial-ground, which was within 100 yards of any of the plaintiff's dwelling-houses. The defendants, having found it necessary to provide a new burial-ground, called a special vestry meeting on the 7th of April, 1905, when a resolution was passed authorizing them to acquire the land in question. At the time of the meeting there was only one house within 100 yards of the proposed cemetery, the owner and occupier of which had given their consent to the land being so used. The plaintiff owned some land adjoining the proposed cemetery which he used as a market garden, but which he intended to develop as a building estate. As soon as he heard what the defendants proposed to do he commenced to build two dwelling-houses on his land, which were in course of erection when the purchase of the land by the defendants was completed, and subsequently built and completed two more houses. The defendants, on the day following the completion of the purchase of the land, caused a burial to take place in the new cemetery within eighty yards of the plaintiff's two dwelling-houses that were in course of erection, in order to shew that they had appropriated the land for burial before any dwelling-houses had been built by the plaintiff. Another burial subsequently took place, likewise within eighty yards of the plaintiff's dwelling-houses, whereupon the plaintiff commenced the present proceedings. Section 9 of the Burial Act, 1855, provides that "no ground not already used as or appropriated for a cemetery shall be used for burials under the said Act or this Act, or either of them, within the distance of 100 yards from any dwelling-house as aforesaid" and such consent shall be "the

consent in writing of the owner, lessee, or occupier of such dwelling-house." For the plaintiff it was contended that the Act gave protection to any houses which were within 100 yards of the burial-ground whenever those houses were erected. For the defendants it was urged that the dwelling-house must be in existence when the land was appropriated in order to get the protection of the statute. The test was whether the ground was appropriated before the adjoining owner first had the right to complain. The word "already" in the section must be read with reference to the time when the land was appropriated as a burial-ground and not with reference to the date of the passing of the Act.

KEKEWICH, J., said that the first point to consider was what was the meaning of the word "already" in section 9 of 18 & 19 Vict. It was quite correct to refer to the former Act where the word was used, because the later Act was a modification of that former Act, and they ought to be read together. He did not agree with the argument that the construction would make the former Act more absurd than the later Act. In point of fact it did not make either Act absurd. They were not dealing with technical words, but with common words of the English language, which must be construed according to the popular meaning, and so construed the word "already" meant "at this time" or "now." Therefore the section read in that manner was as follows: "No ground not now used or appropriated as a cemetery." That must refer to the date when the Act was passed, as there was no date which had reference to an Act except the date when it received the Royal Assent. There was nothing in the authorities to make one think that that was not the correct view. If that was so there was no doubt that at the date of the passing of the Act the land was not used or appropriated as a burial-ground. The case of *Lord Cowley v. Byas* (26 W. R. 1, 5 Ch. D. 944) was not directly in point, but the judgment of Sir G. Jessel, M.R., was extremely instructive as to what the Legislature meant; he said: "The Legislature has taken away to a certain extent the privilege before granted to landowners, for it has changed the original 200 yards into 100 yards, and it appears to me it has altered it in another way by saying in fact, 'All the protection you want is a protection against nuisance; if so much of the cemetery as is within 100 yards of your house is laid out as a park, or garden, or a chapel, or for some other purpose of that kind, and not for actual burial, we do not intend to give you the right to prohibit its being so used, because such does not hurt you.'" He also drew particular attention to the fact that the words used in 18 & 19 Vict. c. 128 did not occur in the former Act. Unless the plaintiff was excluded by the Act he was entitled to say, "You shall not use this land as a burial-ground within 100 yards of my houses." It was clear that the plaintiff could not be prevented from standing on his statutory rights by saying that he had stood by. A more important point was that at the date when the land was acquired and appropriated as a burial-ground there was no dwelling-house in existence. The plaintiff had land on which buildings could be erected, and accordingly he began to run up houses quickly as soon as he heard what was being done, and he now had dwelling-houses within 100 yards of some part of the land which the board desired to use for burials, which land was not used or appropriated at the time when the Act was passed. The question was whether the plaintiff was within the protection of the Act as regards houses which were not erected at the time land was acquired as a cemetery. There was nothing in the Act to indicate that any dwelling-houses were not within the protection of the Act. He therefore failed to see the reason why the plaintiff was not entitled to protection because his house was not erected at the time the land was acquired as a cemetery. The better way to look at it was to say that the plaintiff was the owner of a house which was protected by the Act. The plaintiff had nothing to do with the contention that he had come to a nuisance, because this was not a nuisance in the ordinary sense, but only a statutory nuisance. The plaintiff was entitled to insist upon his legal rights. If the plaintiff was entitled, as he seemed to be, to insist upon the protection of the Act, he was entitled to say that the board should not use this land for burials within 100 yards of his houses. The plaintiff was therefore entitled to the injunction which he sought.—COUNSEL, Macmorran, K.C., and P. F. Wheeler; P. O. Lawrence, K.C., and Galey. SOLICITORS, Kingsford, Dorman, & Co., for Kingsford & Drake, Hythe; White, Bennett, & Co., for G. & Wilks, Hythe.

[Reported by R. FRANKLIN STUBBS, Esq., Barrister-at-Law.]

### High Court—King's Bench Division.

**ECCLIASTICAL COMMISSIONERS FOR ENGLAND v. DURHAM RURAL DISTRICT COUNCIL.** Div. Court. May 1st.

LOCAL AUTHORITY—SEWER—DRAIN—NUISANCE—HIGHWAY BOARD—PUBLIC HEALTH ACT, 1875 (38 & 39 VICT. c. 55), ss. 4, 95—LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT, 1894 (56 & 57 VICT. c. 73), s. 23.

Case stated by the justices of Durham. Upon the hearing of certain complaints preferred by the respondents against the appellants, under section 95 of the Public Health Act, 1875, whereby it was alleged that in or on land in the village of Old Quarrington, situate within the district of the respondents, there was a nuisance arising from a collection of foul sewage which was standing in a disused pond, and that the said nuisance was caused by the act or default of the appellants, the owners of the said premises, and that notice had been served on the appellants requiring them to abate the said nuisance and to execute certain works and do certain things necessary for that purpose—to wit, to cause the whole of the stagnant water and foul sewage to be drained from the disused pond, the latter to be cleaned and the whole of the foul matter to be removed so that the same should no longer be a nuisance or injurious to health as aforesaid, and that the appellants had made

default in complying with the notice aforesaid. The following facts were either proved or admitted: (1) That notices to abate the nuisance had been duly served on the appellants. (2) The appellants were the owners of the farmhouse marked "A" in the plan which accompanied the case. The nuisance complained of consists of a large collection of foul sewage standing in a disused pond in the middle of the village green at Old Quarrington, and has been caused by sewage coming from the premises of the appellants, who admitted the existence of the nuisance. Neither the land between the west side of the public highway nor the pond is the property of the appellants. Formerly a stone conduit at the same point as the existing gully passed under the highway, and drains, stated by the appellants to have been constructed by them about twenty years ago, carried the sewage from the said premises into a hole where the gully now stands, and thence through the conduit under and to the west of the road into an open ditch on the other side of the road, and which ditch emptied itself into the pond. A 4in. drain was stated to have been put in by the appellants about eighteen years ago to drain the water from certain spouts. About twelve years ago the old conduit was taken out by the Durham and Chester-le-Street Highway Board, and the present gully with 9in. pipe under the road and short 4in. drain were substituted by the said highway board for the purpose of carrying off the surface water from the road and conveying it to the pond, the work being carried out under the superintendence of their surveyor, and the highway board connected the drains conveying the sewage from the appellants' premises with the gully. Neither the highway board nor the appellants gave notice as required by the regulations of the respondents of their intention to connect the drains from the appellants' premises with the gully, &c., constructed by the said highway board twelve years ago. On the Local Government Act, 1894, coming into operation the Durham and Chester-le-Street Highway Board ceased to exist and its powers, duties, and liabilities were transferred to the respondents whose servants have since periodically cleaned out the 9in. pipe and gully. (3) The respondents have never in any way repaired the said gully or open channel. The justices were of opinion that the nuisance existing in the said pond was caused by the act of the appellants and made an order for the same to be abated, but stated this case for the opinion of the court. By section 4 of the Public Health Act, 1875, it is provided: "Sewer" includes sewers and drains of every description, except drains to which the word 'drain' interpreted aforesaid applies, and except drains vested in or under the control of any authority having the management of roads and not being a local authority under this Act." Section 25 of the Local Government Act, 1894: "As from the appointed day there shall be transferred to the district council of every rural district all the powers, duties, and liabilities of the rural sanitary authority in the district and of any highway authority in the district, and highway boards shall cease to exist, and rural district councils shall be the successors of the rural sanitary authority and highway authority. . . ." It was agreed for the purpose of this case that although the pond was not the property of the appellants yet the appellants might clear it out without committing a trespass. Counsel for the appellants argued that the 9in. pipe was a sewer, as it drained the sewage of two houses, and in consequence the local authority were under the liability to see that no nuisance occurred, for which *Wilkinson v. Llandaff Rural District Council* (1903, 2 Ch. 693) was ample authority. Even allowing that prior to 1894 this sewer was only a "drain," still after that date the drain was no longer vested in a highway board, but a local authority under the Act of 1875, and therefore it became *ipso facto* a sewer. Counsel for the respondents said that originally it was a drain and not a sewer by reason of the exception in section 4 of the Act of 1875—i.e., it was vested in a highway authority. When the local authority, by section 25 of the Local Government Act, 1894, took over the liabilities, &c., of the highway board, the drain became vested in the local authority *qua* drain of the highway board.

THE COURT (LORD ALVERSTONE, C.J., and RIDLEY and DARLING, JJ.) dismissed the appeal.

LORD ALVERSTONE, C.J., said that if the appellants had established that the 9in. pipe was a sewer then the case cited (*Wilkinson v. Llandaff Rural District Council*) would probably be sufficient to support the appeal. But the pipe was a drain prior to 1894 by reason of section 4 of the Public Health Act, 1874, and it became vested in the local authority by the Act of 1894 as a drain, not as a sewer.

RIDLEY and DARLING, JJ., concurred.—COUNSEL, *Meynell; Macpherson. Solicitors, Crump & Co., for G. Aynsley Smith, Durham; Robbins, Billing, & Co., for J. Chambers, Durham.*

[Reported by MAURICE N. DENOUE, Esq., Barrister-at-Law.]

#### SIVEWRIGHT v. ALLEN. Div. Court. 26th April.

SHIP—SEAMAN—CONTRACT FOR SERVICE—CARRYING CONTRABAND OF WAR—VESSEL CAPTURED AND SUBSEQUENTLY DESTROYED—"LOSS OF THE SHIP"—RIGHT TO WAGES—MERCHANT SHIPPING ACT, 1894 (57 & 58 VICT. C. 60), s. 158.

Special case. The respondent was a seaman serving on board the British steamship *Oldhamia*, of which the appellant was the owner, who had signed articles for a voyage on that ship on the 10th of March, 1905, *The Oldhamia* then being at New York. The voyage, which was not to exceed three years, was to be in specified latitudes—Japan, Manchurian and Siberian ports included. Russia and Japan were then at war, and the vessel, which left New York on the 26th of March, went first to Hong Kong. On the 18th of May, 1905, *The Oldhamia* was proceeding through the China Sea, and, when near Formosa, was taken by a Russian cruiser. There was no evidence of what her cargo consisted of or that the capture by the Russians was justified. After the capture the respondent and the rest of *The Oldhamia's* crew were transferred on board the Russian cruiser *Dnipro*. On the 2nd of June *The Oldhamia* was destroyed, and on the 5th

of June the respondent was landed at Swatau, taken thence to Hong Kong, and finally sent to England as a distressed seaman, arriving on the 5th of September, 1905. The respondent claimed wages before the magistrate up to the 14th of September. On behalf of the appellant it was submitted that wages terminated with the capture of the vessel on the 18th of May, 1905, she then being "lost" within the meaning of section 158 of the Merchant Shipping Act, or at latest on the 2nd of June, 1905, when the vessel was destroyed. The magistrate made an order that the appellant should pay the respondent wages from the 18th of March to the 5th of September, 1905, and costs, the claim for wages to that date being admitted.

LORD ALVERSTONE, C.J., said that the magistrate seemed to have assumed that this court had drawn a distinction between "capture" and "loss" that would enable the respondent to claim wages up to the 5th of September, 1905, in *Austin Friars Steam Shipping Co. v. Strack* (1905, 2 K. B. 315). But that was not so. In his opinion by an occurrence which was practically contemporaneous with the capture of the ship, the ship was destroyed and ceased to exist, and it seemed to him that it would be giving no effect to the word "loss" in the Act of Parliament if they were to hold that where the ship was in fact destroyed by a cause for which the owners were in no way responsible, that that was not a loss within the meaning of the Act. He thought that this ship was lost within the meaning of section 158 and that the appeal must be allowed. He was prepared at present to decide that if there had only been a capture of the ship there would have necessarily been "a loss of the ship."

RIDLEY, J., concurred. The real point was whether what was relied upon as being a loss was equivalent to the destruction of the ship, as the mere taking possession of her by an enemy or by a pirate would not necessarily constitute a "loss" within the section.

DARLING, J., agreed, and pointed out that there was here every element of a loss. The vessel was seized, her crew shipped on board another vessel, and a few days later she was destroyed.—COUNSEL, *J. A. Hamilton, K.C., and Dawson Miller; S. T. Evans, K.C., and M. Morgan. Solicitors, Botterell & Roche; Chivers & Co.*

[Reported by ESKKINE REID, Esq., Barrister-at-Law.]

#### THE KING v. LINNEKER. C.C.R. 1st May.

CRIMINAL LAW—INTENT—ATTEMPT—OFFENCES AGAINST THE PERSON ACT, 1861 (24 & 25 VICT. C. 100), ss. 14 AND 18.

Case stated by Jelf, J., at the trial of James Reginald Linneker at the Derby Winter Assizes on the 3rd of March, 1906, on an indictment charging him under the statute 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100, ss. 14 and 18, in the first count with feloniously attempting to discharge a certain revolver loaded with gunpowder and leaden bullets at one John Plowright Honton with intent to murder him; in the second count the same with intent to commit murder; and in the third count the same with the intent to do the said John Plowright Honton grievous bodily harm. The indictment did not contain the words "by drawing a trigger" nor did it specify any other manner in which the attempt was made, but no objection was taken to the indictment on this score, the only objection being as hereinafter mentioned, that the evidence did not bring the case within the statute. The 14th section is: "Whosoever . . . shall shoot at any person or shall by drawing a trigger or in any other manner attempt to discharge any kind of loaded arm at any person with intent in any of the cases aforesaid to commit murder shall, whether any bodily injury be effected or not, be guilty of felony." Section 18: "Whosoever shall unlawfully and maliciously shoot at any person, or by drawing a trigger or in any other manner attempt to discharge any kind of loaded arms at any person with intent in any of the cases aforesaid to do some grievous bodily harm to any person shall be guilty of felony." The prisoner was convicted under the third count, sentence being postponed to the next assizes and the prisoner being admitted to bail meanwhile subject to the following case: Mr. Honton was the general manager of the Bolsover Colliery. The prisoner, a young man in the employment of the colliery owners, interviewed Mr. Honton at his office on the 16th of February, on the subject of his chances of promotion in the service. There was no sort of quarrel between them. Presently in answer to a question Mr. Honton said, "Why do you ask me that question?" The prisoner said, "I am going to tell you why," and he at once put his right hand into his overcoat pocket and commenced to pull something out. Mr. Honton saw something glitter like silver (which turned out to be a six-barrelled revolver), and it at once struck him that there was going to be some mischief. Before prisoner got the revolver (five barrels of which were loaded) quite clear from his pocket, Mr. Honton jumped up from his chair and sprang upon the prisoner and was able to lay hold of his arm before he could raise it up. Prisoner had got the revolver clear from his pocket and had half risen from his chair when Mr. Honton seized him. They struggled for a few minutes. Once when Mr. Honton tried to open the door prisoner nearly got his arm loose, his right hand holding the revolver. While they were struggling the prisoner said several times, "You've got to die." Eventually Mr. Honton wrested the revolver from him, with the assistance of another witness, and took him to the police station. On the way prisoner said, "I shall very likely have to do time for this, but whether it is long or short I shall do for you when I come out." Mr. Honton said, "Why, what have I done to you?" and prisoner said, "I think you have kept me back." Upon the facts it was submitted by counsel for the defence that there was no evidence of an attempt under the statute either with intent to murder or with intent to do grievous bodily harm. The judge overruled the objection and told the jury that if they thought the prisoner took the revolver out of his pocket for the purpose of shooting Mr. Honton, and that if he had not been interrupted he would have, or probably would have, accomplished that purpose, they might find him guilty of an attempt to discharge the revolver at Mr. Honton with

intent to murder (first and second counts) or with intent to do grievous bodily harm (third count), and they convicted him on the third count. No objection was taken to the language of the summing up, the only point being that there was no case within the statute. The prisoner was not represented by counsel. Counsel for the prosecution submitted that the evidence of the "intent" was admitted, whilst there was clearly evidence of an "attempt" as defined by Stephen, J., in his Digest of the Criminal Law, art. 50: "An attempt to commit a crime is an act done with intent to commit that crime and forming part of a series of acts which would constitute the actual commission if it were not interrupted." He referred to *Q. v. Brown* (15 Cox 199), where the court held upon almost identical facts that no offence was committed under section 15, but all the judges thought an indictment might have been preferred under section 14; *Q. v. St. George* (9 C. & P. 483), *Reg. v. Lewis* (9 C. & P. 523) notwithstanding. Indeed, *Q. v. St. George* was overruled in *Q. v. Duckworth* (1898, 2 Q. B. 83).

THE COURT (LORD ALVERSTONE, C.J., and KENNEDY, RIDLEY, DARLING, and WALTON, JJ.) confirmed the conviction.

LORD ALVERSTONE, C.J., said that if there had only been evidence of intention to shoot, or of preparation to shoot, the conviction could not be maintained. But there was evidence of an attempt to discharge, of acts "forming part of a series of acts."

KENNEDY, RIDLEY, DARLING, and WALTON, JJ., concurred.—COUNSEL, A. M. WHITE, SOLICITOR, M. N. Humble, of Chesterfield.

[Reported by MAURICE N. DRUGGER, Esq., Barrister-at-Law.]

#### DARTFORD BREWERY CO. v. QUARTER SESSIONS OF MIDDLESEX. Div. Court. 27th April.

LICENSING ACTS—RENEWAL OF LICENCES—REFERENCE OF RENEWAL TO QUARTER SESSIONS—DIFFERENTIATING EVIDENCE—LICENSING ACTS (35 & 36 VICT. c. 94), s. 42; 1904 (4 Ed. 7, c. 23), s. 1.

This was a case stated by the chairman of the quarter sessions of the County of London, and raised a point of considerable importance in licensing law. It appeared that on the 26th of February, 1905, the licensing justices caused to be served on the licensee and the registered owners a notice of objection to the renewal of the existing on-licence. The ground of the objection was that the licence was unnecessary. On the 13th of March, 1905, the licensee applied for the renewal of his licence, and the justices decided to refer the matter to the court of quarter sessions. On the 25th of April, 1905, the justices referred the matter to the court of quarter sessions, and reported thereon in the following terms: "Trinity Arms, Church-street, Deptford. There are five licensed houses within 151 yards of this house (the justices set out the names of the houses and their distances from the public-house). The Trinity Arms is one of the smallest houses which have been mentioned, and it is in a rough neighbourhood, consisting of very poor streets. An attempt was made at the hearing to show that there was a considerable floating population of factory hands and men employed at the cattle market. The bench consider that the number of licensed houses in the area referred to, and that of the houses mentioned, this and the Joiner's Arms may be suppressed." At the hearing before quarter sessions on the 26th of June, 1905, evidence was given on behalf of the renewal authority of the number of licensed houses in the district, as to the character and population of the locality between the respective distances, and the other licensed houses above referred to, and a plan of the district, photograph of the premises, and evidence was also given for the first time suggesting that certain of the sanitary arrangements of the public-house in question and the floor of the bar parlour were in a dangerous and defective condition, but the court was of opinion that these allegations were not established by the evidence. No evidence other than that referred to was given to differentiate the Trinity Arms from the other licensed premises mentioned in the report. It was objected on behalf of the licensee and registered holder of the premises that there was no evidence which would entitle the court of quarter sessions to refuse the renewal of the licence, and they relied on *Raven v. Justices of Southampton* (1904, 1 K. B. 430) and *R. v. Tithurst* (1905, 2 K. B. 478). The court of quarter sessions by a majority refused the renewal of the licence, and the question was whether they were legally entitled to do so. On behalf of the appellant reliance was placed on the two cases above mentioned, and it was also contended that the justices' report was not evidence on which the quarter sessions would act. Apart from the report, there was no evidence differentiating the Trinity Arms. On behalf of the respondents it was contended that the quarter sessions could act on the justices' report.

THE COURT (RIDLEY and DARLING, JJ.) allowed the appeal.

RIDLEY, J.—I think that this appeal must be allowed. The question is whether the report furnished by the district justices is a document which is in itself evidence on which the court of quarter sessions may act. I have come to the conclusion that it is not. The court has decided in more than one instance that the result of section 1 of the Licensing Act, 1904, under which these proceedings were for the first time brought into being, that the body of justices which had to deal with the matter was not the body that had to decide the question of renewal. They have only to come to a conclusion as to whether the renewal of any particular licence on grounds other than those on which the renewal could be refused by them requires consideration. If they think it does they must refer it to quarter sessions, which, through its committee, is to decide whether the licence is to be renewed or not. The effect of the cases which have been cited before us is that the district justices must have some evidence before them before they can report the case to quarter sessions, and that that evidence must be upon oath. And in *Raven v. Justices of Southampton* it had been decided that there must be differentiating evidence before the quarter sessions.—COUNSEL, *Avery*, K.C., and *Haydon*; *Bodkin*. SOLICITORS, *Sir R. Nicholson*; *Graham, Nicholson, & Beasley*.

[Reported by ALAN HOGG, Esq., Barrister-at-Law.]

#### Solicitors' Cases.

In the Matter of JAMES SCOTT DUCKERS AND OF THE LEGAL PRACTITIONERS ACT, 1875. 20th and 24th April.

SOLICITORS' BILL—LEAVE TO SUE WITHIN MONTH OF DELIVERY—INFERIOR COURTS—MAYOR'S COURT.

Application was made to the Registrar of the Mayor's Court for leave to sue an assurance association in that court on a solicitor's bill of costs within the statutory period of one month from delivery of the signed bill. The items of the bill were all in respect of an action in the Mayor's Court and subject to the Mayor's Court scale. It was held that there was no jurisdiction to grant the application, as the Mayor's Court has no general power under the Solicitors Acts, but that an action brought in that court within the month would be liable to be stayed, as the disability is personal to the solicitor, and that no action could be brought within the month, except by special leave of the High Court, either in the Mayor's Court or in the High Court.

Application was then made in the King's Bench Division *ex parte* to Sutton, J., in chambers, and was supported by affidavit bringing the case within section 2 of the Legal Practitioners Act, 1875.

SUTTON, J., granted leave generally to bring an action within a month from delivery of the signed bill, but declined to express any opinion as to the effect of his order upon proceedings in an inferior court. Upon production of the sealed copy order, a plaint was subsequently issued in the Mayor's Court.

#### Case of Last Sittings.

High Court—King's Bench Division.

CURTIS v. SKINNER. Div. Court. 9th April.

FACTORY ACTS—WORKSHOP—PREMISES USED BY WAY OF TRADE OR FOR PURPOSES OF GAIN—FACTORY AND WORKSHOP ACT, 1901 (1 Ed. 7, c. 22), s. 149.

This was a case stated, and raised a question as to whether a certain place was a workshop within the meaning of the Factory and Workshop Act, 1901. The appellant was charged on an information laid by the respondent, an inspector of factories and workshops, for that he on the 3rd of August, 1905, being an occupier of a certain workshop, had not that day a copy of the abstract prescribed by section 128 (1) of the Act affixed therein. The facts of the case are as follows: The appellant was a fishing-boat owner and occupied a warehouse with chambers over and above other premises, locally known as a beating-chamber, in which his fishing stores were deposited, and in which persons in his employ mended and repaired nets belonging to his fishing-boats and used by him in his business. Boat owners employed in the fishing business employed men and women varying with the number of their fishing boats in mending and repairing the fishing nets used by them in their business. The chambers in which this work was done were locally known as beating-chambers, and men and women, varying in number, worked therein in the repair and mending of fishing nets, and the owners of the fishing boats had access to and control of the premises. When the inspector visited the premises on the 3rd of August he found three women and one man, who were each of them engaged in mending and repairing certain parts of fishing nets belonging to the appellant's fishing boats and used by him in his business. No abstract of the Factory and Workshop Act was affixed or exhibited and the appellant had declined to so affix or exhibit one. The justices decided that the beating-chamber was a workshop within the meaning of section 149 (1) (b) of the Act, as being premises in which manual labour was exercised for purposes of gain in or incidental to some of the following purposes—namely, the altering, repairing, ornamenting, or finishing of any article, and so on, to which premises the employer of the persons working therein had the right of access or control. They accordingly convicted the appellant and fined him 1s. and costs. Section 149 (1) (b) is as follows: "The expression workshop means any premises, room, or place, not being a factory, and in which . . . any manual labour is exercised by way of trade or for purposes of gain in or incidental to any of the following purposes—namely, the altering, repairing, ornamenting, or finishing of any article . . . and to or over which premises, room, or place . . . the employer of the persons working therein has the right of access and control." On behalf of the appellant it was contended that the case was governed by *Nash v. Hollinshead* (1901, 1 K. B. 700), where it was decided that a farm was not a non-textile factory because one of the farm labourers was employed to work a mill for grinding meal to be used to feed stock on the farm. The word "gain" in the Act meant direct gain. The appellant did not sell nets. On behalf of the appellant it was contended that the proper test was whether the workmen employed in separate labour. *Nash v. Hollinshead* was an extreme case. Counsel cited *Mooney v. Edinburgh and District Tramway Co.* (4 Fraser 300).

THE COURT (RIDLEY and DARLING, JJ.) allowed the appeal and quashed the conviction.

RIDLEY, J.—This is a case of considerable nicety, but the way has been cleared for us by the case of *Nash v. Hollinshead*. In all the judgments in that case the point was taken that the meal was not going to be sold, and therefore there was no direct gain. Apply that to the present case. A fisherman was obliged to mend his nets. He did not sell them, but did make an indirect gain in catching fish with them and selling the fish. Counsel had contended that the test was, were the workmen employed

in separate labour, and I instanced the case of a man who had so much of this kind of work to do as to have a separate establishment. I think that that makes no difference, and that the only logical test is the one provided in *Nash's case*.—COUNSEL, *Hextall*; *Rowlatt*. SOLICITORS, *Dubois & Co.*, for *Chamberlain & Taylor*, Lowestoft; *Solicitor to the Treasury*.

[Reported by ALAN HOGG, Esq., Barrister-at-Law.]

## Societies.

### The Law Society.

#### GENERAL MEETING.

The general meeting of the Law Society usual in April was held on Friday, the 27th ult., at the Law Institution, Chancery-lane, the President, Mr. C. MYLNE BARKER (London) occupying the chair. There were also present the Vice-President, Mr. William Francis Fladgate, and the following members of the Council: Mr. James Samuel Beale, Mr. Edmund Kell Blyth, Mr. Ebenezer John Bristow, Mr. Robert Ellett (Cirencester), Mr. William Edward Foster (Aldershot), Mr. Samuel Garrett, Mr. William Edward Gillett, Mr. Henry James Johnson, Mr. Stephen Henham King (Maidstone), Mr. William George King, Mr. Harry Wilmot Lee, Mr. Henry Manisty, Mr. Richard Pennington, Mr. Richard Stephens Taylor, Mr. Walter Trower, Mr. William Howard Winterbotham, and Mr. Philip Witham; the following extraordinary members: Mr. William Charles Mercer Adam (Bath), Mr. Thomas Eggar (Brighton), Mr. Charles Elton Longmore (Hertford), and Mr. Robert Pybus (Newcastle); Mr. E. Williamson (secretary), Mr. S. P. Bucknill (assistant secretary), and Mr. H. F. Brown (deputy assistant secretary). The business upon the agenda constituted a record, the number of notices of motions and questions being far in excess of those at any previous general meeting.

#### PRIZES AND CERTIFICATES.

The PRESIDENT distributed the prizes and certificates awarded to successful candidates at the honours examination in January last as follows: First class, in order of merit—Mr. Harold Moreton Moss, articulated to Mr. N. A. E. Way, Chester, and Messrs. Chester, Broome, & Griffiths, London; Mr. Sydney Evershed Agate, articulated to Mr. A. H. Wortnington, Manchester, and Messrs. Cunliffe & Davenport, London; Mr. Richard Webb, M.A. (Oxon.), articulated to Mr. W. E. Bateson, Liverpool; Mr. Anthony Hedley Leathart, B.A. (Oxon.), articulated to Mr. Robert Pybus, Newcastle-on-Tyne; Mr. Gerald Fredk. Nalder, articulated to Messrs. Marrack, Nalder, & Hockin, Truro. Second class, in alphabetical order—Mr. John Arthur Bancroft, articulated to Mr. Robert Loch, Tenby, and Messrs. Rawle, Johnstone, & Co., London; Mr. Frank Beverley, LL.B. (London), articulated to Mr. E. H. Middlebrook, Leeds; Mr. Thomas Ashworth Buckley, articulated to Mr. B. T. Westwell, Accrington; Mr. Charles Crebbib, articulated to Mr. Alfred Bates, Morecambe; Mr. Chas. Augustus Davis, articulated to Mr. A. W. Burchell, London; Mr. Fredk. Edward Ernest John Hall, articulated to Mr. Alexander Neill, Bradford; Mr. Cuthbert Hall Hislop, LL.B. (London), articulated to Mr. Jas. Heslop, Manchester; Mr. Wm. Wetherell Hodgson, articulated to Mr. F. R. Stevenson, Darlington; Mr. Cyril Dunman Lacey, articulated to Mr. C. J. Lacey, Bournemouth; Mr. Arthur Jas. Gurney Lindsell, B.A. (Camb.), articulated to Mr. A. T. Simpson, Tunbridge Wells; Mr. Herbert Linley, articulated to Mr. E. E. Smith, Manchester; Mr. Ernest Nash, articulated to Mr. Churton Taylor, London; Mr. Morgan Isaac Walters, articulated to Mr. Gwilym Jones, Mountain Ash. Third class, in alphabetical order—Mr. Francis Eric Leonard Bache, articulated to Mr. T. F. Bache, West Bromwich; Mr. Wm. Burton Cooper, LL.B. (London), articulated to Mr. Harry Hall, Hull; Mr. Geo. Fras. Donne, articulated to the late Mr. A. V. Treacher and Mr. J. K. Nye, both of Brighton; Mr. John Harold Hopkins, articulated to Mr. R. S. Holmes, Newcastle-on-Tyne; Mr. William Howes Linnell, articulated to Mr. F. Ellen, Northampton; Mr. Jas. Victor Lister, articulated to Mr. M. H. Jones, Liverpool; Mr. Chas. Barton Milton, articulated to Mr. A. R. Norman, Chatham, and Mr. W. A. E. Headley, London; Mr. Arthur Sidney Fitzgerald Pruen, articulated to Messrs. Winterbotham, Gurney, & Co., Cheltenham, and Messrs. Waterhouse & Co., London; Mr. Fredk. Jotcham White, articulated to Mr. F. G. Salisbury, Bristol. The Council had accordingly given certificates and awarded prizes of books as follows: Mr. Moss, Clement's Inn prize (value about £10) and Daniel Reardon prize (value about £20); Mr. Agate, Clifford's Inn prize (value five guineas); Mr. Wedd, New Inn prize (value five guineas) and John Mackrell prize (value about £12); Messrs. Leathart and Nalder, Law Society's prizes (value five guineas each). The Council have given class certificates to the candidates in the second and third classes.

#### PRESIDENT'S REMARKS.

The PRESIDENT said: Before commencing the business of the meeting as indicated by the agenda, I propose, with your permission, to make a short statement with respect to one or two Bills before Parliament affecting the interest of the profession which have been engaging the attention of the Council.

#### UNDISCHARGED BANKRUPTS.

In the first place I should refer to the Bill which the Council have long desired to see passed, to give them the power to refuse a certificate to practise to undischarged bankrupts. There can be but one feeling with regard to this matter—namely, that it is a scandal that a number of solicitors should be enabled to continue to practise, and to receive

the moneys of their clients in the ordinary way of business, when they are undischarged bankrupts. As you will find set out in my address at Leeds, the progress of the Bill has been retarded in previous Parliaments, but I am now glad to be able to report that the Lord Chief Justice (who has always taken the greatest interest in our branch of the profession) has introduced a Bill in the House of Lords, and has promised to do his utmost to get it through the House at the earliest opportunity. The Council will then use whatever influence they may possess with the view of its being carried in the House of Commons.

#### CONVEYANCING BILLS.

Since the year 1885, when the last equity lawyer occupied the Wool-sack, there have been no suggestions for the reform of the law of real property other than those that have originated with this society. Their Conveyancing Bill, introduced by Lord Davey in the year 1897, was not viewed with favour by those in authority, who were bent on establishing an official department to which landowners were to be compelled to resort, but the Council have endeavoured, as you will see from their annual reports, to carry through various reforms of an uncontroversial character, on the lines laid down by the Conveyancing and Settled Lands Acts of the early eighties, which, as you are aware, originated with this society, and have proved an unqualified success. Bills prepared on their instructions to amend the Settled Lands Acts, the Conveyancing Acts, and the Married Women's Property Acts, of which Lord Davey has been good enough to take charge, have been read a second time in the House of Lords, and have been referred to a Select Committee, and will, I hope, make some substantial progress during the present Session.

#### SOLICITORS AS JUSTICES.

The Justices of the Peace Bill (No. 2), 1906, was read a second time in the Commons on Tuesday last, and, if passed, will remove the remaining disqualifications of solicitors as county justices. As the law now stands, solicitors may be appointed borough justices, although they practise in the borough, but must give an undertaking not to practise before the borough bench. Before the year 1871 solicitors were absolutely disqualified for appointment as county justices. In that year the Act 34 Vict. c. 18, promoted by this society, in part removed the disqualification, but a solicitor continued to be disqualified from appointment as a county justice if he practised in the county. The hardship of this became more apparent when the Local Government Act, 1894, made chairmen of district councils county justices by virtue of their office, if not otherwise disqualified. The Law Society has made many attempts to get the disqualification removed, but without success, though the Bills promoted by them several times passed the House of Lords, and in 1896 their Bill, under charge of the present Lord Chancellor, was read a second time in the Commons. The London Government Act, 1899, s. 24, however, removed the disqualification of solicitors elected mayors of the London boroughs, such mayors being by virtue of their office justices for the County of London, but they are not allowed to practise before the justices. The present Bill follows the precedent of the London Government Act, and enables solicitors to be appointed county justices, but precludes them from practising before the county or borough justices. This the Council think is only proper.

#### PUBLIC TRUSTEE BILL.

The profession will naturally desire to know something of the position taken by the Council with regard to the Public Trustee Bill introduced by the Lord Chancellor in the House of Lords, and I am happy to say that the Lord Chancellor has shown every desire to hear and consider, although he has not altogether met, the views of the Council with respect to the measure he is introducing. We may, I feel confident, rest assured that the Lord Chancellor is proceeding in no hostile spirit to us as a profession. He merely desires to secure and safeguard trust funds, and that is a project which may well engage the attention of a statesman. The Council are in communication with the Lord Chancellor, and if I am not in a position to state anything very definite, it is because the matter has not arrived at a definite stage, but I desire to state that, with regard to the establishment of a public trustee, we have endeavoured to point out to the Lord Chancellor that in our view the establishment of such an office would be unnecessary, would tend to the expenditure of large sums of money unnecessarily, and would be of no public benefit, but rather the reverse. You will have noticed that the Lord Chancellor's Bill contains clauses authorising the appointment of custodian trustees, and the audit of trust accounts. For the ideas contained in these clauses the Council are responsible, but they desire to see the clauses amended in several particulars. The Council are also in favour of the simplification of the practice as regards distingas notices, and will propose amendments of the Bill with this object. Of course it must not be forgotten that this is a Government measure, and the Lord Chancellor, with the majority at his back, can pass the Bill if he thinks fit, but as to the appointment of a public trustee with administrative powers we associate ourselves with the bankers and other branches of the mercantile community, and we are bound to offer to the proposal our strenuous opposition.

#### CUSTODY OF TRUST PROPERTY.

Mr. W. P. W. PHILLIMORE (London) moved, in accordance with notice: "That in view of the persistent efforts made to establish a public official trustee, this meeting is of opinion that it is inexpedient merely to object negatively to the suggested extension of officialism, and considers that it would be wiser to formulate an alternative constructive policy, and therefore requests the Council to consider and

to report at the next general meeting as to the expediency of this society undertaking the custody of trust property, and of providing a registry of annual audited trust accounts available for the inspection of all beneficiaries vested or contingent." He said he would have preferred to have seen the motion moved by some more prominent member of the profession concerned with the administration of trust funds, such as one of the great conveyancing practitioners. It was a coincidence that in the motion there was a suggestion respecting the custody of trust property, and provision for auditing trust accounts, but he had not seen any notice of it at the time when he had sent in his motion. He should like to disclaim any intention under cover of his motion of making any suggestion that the society should fulfil the office of a public trustee, for he thought that, whether a public trustee took the form of a Government trustee, or of one set in motion by the society, it would be equally objectionable to the profession at large and to their clients. His object was a much simpler and humbler one. They could not help remembering that the cry for a public trustee had arisen from the default of trustees and solicitors in the past. It was of very little use for a society or anybody to take up a purely hostile attitude to any amendment of the law if there was some *prima facie* reason for attempting to alter such a law, as undoubtedly there was in the case of trustees. The object of these Trustee Bills was to undoubtedly reassure the public at large, their clients, that the Government of the land would take care that their funds were properly protected in the future. If they could formulate some scheme by which this desirable end would be attained, he thought that, whether the Public Trustee Bill were passed or not, it was a comparatively minor point. His first suggestion was that the society should undertake the custody of trust property—that was to say, not to deal with it in an administrative manner, but merely to hold it in the coffers of the society.

The President: Or Council.

Mr. PHILLIMORE said that he took it that the society and the Council were synonymous for all practical purposes. The Council administered the functions of the society, and it would practically be under the management of the Council. The society at large was at present the registrar of solicitors, but he thought Mr. Williamson, the secretary, held the position of deputy registrar, and it would be quite possible for the society to hold the position of custodian of trust funds, and that the President or Mr. Williamson should be the deputy custodian. The object would be that a certain formality would have to be undergone by the trust when the trustee wished to deal with the fund. And it would also have this alternative result, that in case of, say, various securities, it would be impossible for any fraudulent trustee—he did not say fraudulent solicitor, simply any fraudulent trustee—to make use of trust securities for the purpose of satisfying two, three, or four trusts. If they were in the coffers of the society, they would not be dealt with fraudulently in this way. There would be always a standing list of securities of each trust, and the trustee at the outset would furnish to the society a list of such persons, the beneficiaries, vested or contingent, who were interested in the security of these funds, and they, under proper regulations, could satisfy themselves that the society had not misdealt with the trust funds. There was the necessity that beneficiaries who were not actually life tenants should be satisfied in such cases that the funds which they at some future time would come into the enjoyment of were being preserved. All this, of course, was purely voluntary for the creator of the trusts to authorise the trustee to do. Each trust, he thought, ought to have an annual or interest account, and that ought to be open to every interested person in the trust. At present, as they knew, it was not always easy to ascertain how trust funds stand. No doubt they would be told that it was possible for a beneficiary to apply to the solicitor or trustee concerned and ask him for his account of what was the position of the trust, but he would probably be told that he could have these particulars at his own expense and not at the expense of the trust. That was, in a sense, very proper, but it operated as a deterrent to any one asking for information. If an account was filed in a responsible office, such as the society's, it would be open only to those who had a genuine interest in the maintenance of the trust. That difficulty would be soon obviated, because any suspicious vested or contingent beneficiary would be at liberty to come to the office and apply to the custodian to be allowed to see the state of the annual account of his trust. There would have to be a small fee charged for its production.

Mr. CHAS. FORD (London) seconded the motion. He said he had for a long time been anxious to facilitate discussion at these meetings, and they must be grateful to Mr. Phillimore for putting the motion on the paper. The probability was that Mr. Phillimore would have placed it before them in a somewhat different form if he had known of the valuable statement the President had made upon this subject at this meeting. In view of the fact that the Council were actively moving in the matter, and were in communication on behalf of the society with the Lord Chancellor upon that very question, he suggested the desirability of withdrawing the motion, upon the understanding that it might be brought forward if things did not take so favourable a turn as they might desire.

Mr. H. DIXON KIMBER (London) said he had given notice of an amendment to the motion, but in view of the remarks of the President he wished to withdraw the notice. It seemed to him that they were fast degenerating into confusion between the question of solicitors and their clients and trustees and their *cestui que trust*. Solicitors were not the only trustees by a long way, therefore in providing for the security of trust funds one had not only to consider the steps to be taken against solicitors. His own feeling was that solicitors were already subject to liability for malpractices to

which few in other classes of men were subject, and if the Council would, as he believed they did now more than in times gone by, more seriously consider these malpractices, and deal more severely with those who came under their notice, he thought it would probably be found that, as far as solicitors were concerned, there was all the deterrent force necessary, and he did not think the infliction of any other penalties would suffice if those at hand were not sufficient. The amendment of which he had given notice ran: "To omit all the words after 'the next general meeting,' and to insert the following: 'or at an extraordinary general meeting to be specially convened the outlines of a scheme which they may consider best calculated to meet the objects aimed at, without prejudice nevertheless to the full liberty of action of the Council meanwhile on the subject generally in any way they may think fit.'"

Mr. PHILLIMORE said that his object would probably have been attained by the discussion which had taken place. He had not fettered the action of the Council in any way, and he was quite willing to withdraw the motion.

The motion was accordingly withdrawn.

#### LAND TRANSFER.

Mr. J. S. RUBINSTEIN (London) moved, in accordance with notice:—“(1) That having regard to the fact that the imperfections, complications, and dangers of the registration system have been so clearly pointed out and condemned by the judges in the recent cases of *The Capital and Counties Bank v. Rhodes* (1903), *Attorney-General v. Odell* (1905), and *Marshall v. Robertson* (1905), this meeting hereby records its opinion that the Order made in 1898 applying the compulsory provisions of the Land Transfer Act, 1897, to the County of London should be suspended in accordance with the provisions in the Act, leaving landowners free to register or not as they consider best in their own interest. (2) That a copy of the foregoing resolution be sent to the Lord Chancellor, the Prime Minister, the President of the Privy Council, and the London County Council. (3) That communications be sent to the following bodies who have already expressed an unfavourable opinion as to the working of the existing system of compulsory registration, with a view to arranging for a deputation to attend upon the Lord Chancellor on the subject: The Corporation of the City of London, the eighteen Metropolitan Borough Councils parties to a petition presented to Parliament in June, 1903, the Auctioneers' Institute, Building Societies' Association, Central Association of Bankers, Incorporated Association for the Protection of Property Owners, Land Law Reform Association, London Chamber of Commerce, Surveyors' Institute, and United Property Owners' and Ratepayers' Association.” He said he had called the attention of the society on previous occasions to the working of the Act, and thought that a very useful purpose had been served by such discussions, as they had tended largely to educate the public mind in this important matter. He thought the time had arrived when another discussion might be of value, because it did not rest now entirely upon the view the members of the solicitor branch of the profession had taken on it, but they could now rely upon the views of the judges who had had the subject under their consideration. Solicitors, no doubt, at the outset, having an expert knowledge of the subject as he might term it, had pointed out that there were terrible difficulties and complications in the registration system. They had urged that the system in place of one that had worked well was not a simple system, and, further, that it opened a very wide door for fraud, and that in the course of time they might certainly calculate that there would be people capable of taking advantage of the system and of committing fraud. He wanted particularly to call attention to three decisions which had been given on the Act, because they illustrated the extreme complication and danger of the system, and shewed that the views held by solicitors originally had been amply justified. The first case was *The Capital and Counties Bank v. Rhodes*, decided in the Court of Appeal in 1903—

The President: I think you may take it that we are familiar with that case.

Mr. RUBINSTEIN said he would assume that the meeting was familiar with the nature of the dispute in that case, but he thought that as a matter of record it was very desirable that he should quote a few words from the judgment of Lord Justice Cozens-Hardy as bearing upon the matter under consideration. Lord Justice Cozens-Hardy said: “It is worthy of remark that section 20 of the Act of 1897, which provides that a person should not under a conveyance or sale acquire the legal estate unless or until he is registered as proprietor is by sub-section 2 limited to the first registration. In other words, it is merely a sort of indirect compulsion, a means of getting land on the register: it does not alter the general scheme of the Act after land is once on the register. The legal estate will pass on any subsequent conveyance on sale without registration. There is no penalty imposed on non-registration, although the land, where as in the present case registration is compulsory, cannot be removed from the register: there is no need for any change to be made in the register of proprietors. Conveyancing may proceed just as if the Acts of 1875 and 1879 had not been passed. Self-interest and the desire for security will doubtless induce persons, whether purchasers, mortgagees, or lessors, to make use of the register. But the legal operation and effect of common law assurances will remain untouched by the want of registration.” As practical men, they would see at once what a blow this gave to the existing system of registration by stating that once you complied with the requisitions of the 1897 Act by placing your land on the register, you subsequently carried out your dealings ignoring the register, and he believed that practice had been largely followed by the profession. The second case was

**Attorney-General v. Odell.** That arose in consequence of an innocent person getting a transfer of a mortgage registering himself as the registered owner of the charge. It turned out that that transfer was a forgery, and the registered owner had consequently to allow his registration to be vacated. Upon that he called upon the registrar to make good his loss. He had advanced £350 on the strength of this forged transfer, which had been registered, and he said he was entitled to an indemnity. The registrar agreed that he was entitled, under the circumstances, to be indemnified, but the authority over the head of the registrar, the Treasury, said: "Are we to pay this £350 for what we never had? We did not have the money, and we won't pay it." The case came before Mr. Justice Kekewich, who upheld the registrar, but the Court of Appeal upset his decision, and the unfortunate person who relied upon the registration, and the registrar thought ought to be indemnified, lost his money. The last case was the case of *Marshall v. Robertson* (reported 50 SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, 75), and that was likely to be followed by a great many others later on, and consequently was well deserving of the attention of the meeting. This was a case of a man named Norris, who was in possession of some land at Hammersmith. He had no title, but was a squatter. He conveyed this land to a Mr. Watson, and this conveyance of land to which Norris had no title was registered, and Norris was put upon the register. Norris thereupon obtained an advance from two young ladies, who took the certificate as absolute proof of title. When the true owner of the land discovered what had been done, he took steps to get the transfer removed from the register, and the judge naturally could do no more or less. Mr. Justice Warrington said: "It seems to me that this case illustrates in the most forcible manner the extreme danger which was introduced in 1875 of allowing a person to register himself as the owner of land with a possessory title. . . . Is it conceivable that if Norris had gone to these defendants he would have been able to raise money on this piece of land? It seems to me that it is the registration of the possessory title with the power of producing the certificate of registration which has done all the mischief in this case, and has induced the defendants to lend their money, which, of course, they will now, as a result of this judgment, lose. I think it right to point that out, because it does seem to me to illustrate very forcibly the danger which the registration with possessory title introduces." Those were cases where the judges had had the system put before them. He did say that, in view of those cases pointing out the complications and the dangers of the system, the registrar was not justified in leading the people to believe that the system is a valuable and safe one. The registry had issued to-day what they called a short statement of the objects and practical working of the system of registration title. They told one what the registry of title was. They said legal validity was given to this title by Act of Parliament. The consequence was that any purchaser of registered land had no need to make any inquiry into the title, but merely to see that the person he was dealing with was the registered proprietor. Anyone seeing such a statement made by a private person, and acting on it, would, he ventured to say, have the right to make the person liable civilly, and perhaps somewhere else. The system being open to the objections to which he had referred, the question was whether they should not go back to what they did not so much object to, and that was to make it permissive, so as to leave any person to register or not as he pleased. The strongest advocate of the permissive system was originally Mr. Brickdale.

The PRESIDENT said Mr. Rubinstein had often called attention at these meetings to that, but he did not think that recapitulation added to their case.

Mr. RUBINSTEIN urged that it did add strength to their case. Although those in that hall were familiar with the matter, the public were not, and it was very difficult to get the public to have that outside knowledge with which the President and others present were familiar. Mr. Brickdale, in his work on Land Transfer, published in 1886, concluded with the following words: "If only an easy door is opened to the many who do believe in it, and are willing to go in and give it a trial, coupled with proper care that those who enter should not be disappointed with the experiment, the system will advertise itself, and after two or three years every purchaser will register as a matter of course." There he said let the thing advertise itself; do not force people to go compulsorily, and after two or three years everyone will go. He (Mr. Rubinstein) asked that they should go back to that state of things now, after the policy had been tried for over seven, instead of the three years originally intended. Let them go back to the permissive system. Let those who believed in the register by all means make use of it, but it was unjust and unfair to force people to go to the register who did not.

Mr. P. G. C. SHAW (London) formally seconded the motion. As a practitioner having had some little experience of the working of the Act, he might say that it had been a failure. It had not met what had been required or expected by the Legislature in passing the Act, and the practitioners and the public at large were not benefited by it, but, on the contrary, they were very much hampered. The public were put to considerable expense, and no security was obtained, but, on the other hand, to his mind, probably the security was very much threatened. Where was the protection? He thought they were very much obliged to Mr. Rubinstein for his efforts in the matter, and for his able advocacy, in addition to the efforts of the Council in trying to bring about a better state of affairs, which probably might tend to the suspension or some modification of the Act. He was sure the public would be well served if these abominable Acts were either repealed or suspended.

Mr. J. S. BEALE (London), a member of the Council, suggested a slight amendment, to which he thought Mr. Rubinstein would not object. The motion limited the action of the Council to be taken against the Act to a deputation to the Lord Chancellor. He (Mr. Beale) did not think that desirable. At the present time a deputation to the Lord Chancellor would not be an efficient course of action. He suggested that these words should be omitted, and the matter left to the Council to act as they thought best.

Mr. RUBINSTEIN said he had been only dealing with the first motion of which he had given notice. If that were carried he would have a word to say with regard to the others.

The PRESIDENT suggested that it would be better to take them *en bloc*.

Mr. BEALE said that if these words were omitted, which really limited the action of the Council, they would have a free hand. He thought that public discussion would be much more likely to be efficient, and meeting with other bodies who were interested, than going to the Lord Chancellor. They knew he was committed to a particular view of the working of the Act. Speaking for himself, he (Mr. Beale) should not care to be a member of the deputation.

The PRESIDENT said that no doubt Mr. Rubinstein would be guided by what Mr. Beale had said, and would omit the words in question.

Mr. RUBINSTEIN said he did believe in doing something practical.

The PRESIDENT: Do you or do you not accept the suggestion?

Mr. RUBINSTEIN said he would rather hear the view of the meeting. It might be, as Mr. Beale said, that he knew the view of the Lord Chancellor. He (Mr. Rubinstein) knew that the Lord Chancellor did express certain views some time back, but a great deal had happened since then. He did not want to limit the Council to that course of action, but he really thought they should see the Lord Chancellor. The late Lord Chancellor, for some reason, had not been particularly desirous that the society should send him a deputation, but he had no reason to imagine that the present Lord Chancellor would not receive them courteously. If Mr. Beale did not like to be a member of the deputation, he (Mr. Rubinstein) would not mind going himself.

The PRESIDENT asked Mr. Rubinstein whether he thought any practical good would result from an interview with the Lord Chancellor. He was entirely of Mr. Beale's opinion. He thought it would not do the slightest good; it would be only beating the air. They might be vexed about it, but he thought that if they were going to take any steps they should be actuated by prudence and wisdom.

Mr. RUBINSTEIN took it that the value of the deputation would be that the society had a certain number of speakers who would be able to express the views of solicitors, the deputation would be noticed in the public Press, and it would be consequently very valuable, as their case would be heard in public as offered to the Lord Chancellor.

Mr. FORD thought it would be very desirable to take the view of the meeting as to amending the motion as proposed. He would move that the words be omitted, and for this reason. They should not be very timorous in going to the Lord Chancellor on a deputation, but he understood that the Lord Chancellor had very marked views, and he would not probably be very much influenced by the deputation. He would be very much more likely to be influenced by the commercial and other bodies who were interested, and it would be much better that deputations should go to the Lord Chancellor from building societies, trustees, and so forth. It would be the wisest and most prudent course to amend the motion as proposed. He moved the omission of the words "with a view to arranging for a deputation to attend upon the Lord Chancellor on the subject."

Mr. F. O. TAYLOR (Norwich) thought that, after the expression of opinion of Mr. Beale, it would be very undesirable for Mr. Rubinstein to press that portion of the motion. He thought that the whole provincial body of solicitors recognised the great services Mr. Rubinstein had rendered in this matter. He seconded the amendment.

Mr. KIMBER said that the motion only said "with a view to arranging a deputation to attend upon the Lord Chancellor." He took it that the Council, after having sent communications to the various bodies interested, would probably invite those bodies to send delegates and have a conference, and the result would be, if the conference decided not to go to the Lord Chancellor, nothing more would be done with that. But he urged that it was most desirable that the Council should be furnished with all the power possible.

Mr. BEALE said his objection to the words was that they limited the action of the Council. If words were substituted widening the action of the Council, he thought they would all be agreed. With a view to arranging the matter, he would suggest that words should be added "on the subject or taking such further action as may be desirable."

Mr. RUBINSTEIN said he would accept that with pleasure.

The motions were then carried *en bloc*, with the alteration suggested by Mr. Beale.

#### SOLICITORS' CERTIFICATE TAX.

Mr. PHILLIMORE moved, in accordance with notice: "That the time has arrived when (failing its total abolition) a more equitable arrangement of the solicitors' certificate tax should be sought for — (a) by abolishing the distinction between town and country certificates; (b) by imposing a certificate duty upon practising barristers as well as upon practising solicitors; and (c) by entrusting its collection to the Income Tax Commissioners with instructions to assess the tax proportionately to the income earned, thus abolishing the present inequitable anomaly that the recipient of a professional income of £150 pays the same amount of certificate duty as the practitioner who earns £1,500 a year." He said that this was not the first time that the question had been

in that hall. The incidence of the duty was unfair on the general body of practitioners, and he saw no reason except that which had been brought forward on former occasions against the Council taking action, that the society derived some benefit from certifying that solicitors were still on the roll. Beyond that, he saw no reason why the Council should not take steps to obtain a more equitable distribution of the burden of the solicitors' certificate duty. If it could not be altogether abolished, at least 80 per cent. of the profession desired, at all events, that the distinction between town and country practitioners should be got rid of. It was impossible to see why a tax on professional learning should be limited only to the solicitor branch of the profession, and why it should not be imposed upon the bench and the bar, even to the Lord Chancellor. He said in his motion the bar, but he had added, standing there, also the bench, because they also had emoluments from the practice of their profession, and he did not see why such august individuals as Lord Chancellors and Lord Chief Justices should not be taxed equally in proportion with the humbler members of the profession. The incidence of a tax, he believed it was generally accepted in principle, ought to be in proportion to the benefits derived by those who were taxed. Those who got much from their profession in their professional capacity ought to be taxed in proportion. The only way by which that could be done was to tax them on their professional income. It would simplify the collection of the tax, and it would be very easy to arrange the total amount—the Inland Revenue would be able to settle that quickly enough—the same as was derived from the profession at large at the present time. By the adoption of such a course the society would have removed from them the duty of acting practically as tax-gatherers, and it would also have the advantage that it would remove from the society the very objectionable practice by which they practically persecuted those who were too poor to pay for their annual certificates.

Mr. HARVEY CLIFTON (London) said that, rather than allow the motion to fall, he would second it. He agreed with everything Mr. Phillimore had said, with the exception of the taxation of the bench, which would obviously be impossible. There was a very strong feeling, especially amongst the younger members of the profession, that the tax was unfair. He believed it was imposed in the time of war, in a time of exceptional taxation; but when the cause had gone the tax remained. They all knew how difficult it was to remove a tax, and a former Chancellor of the Exchequer had shown himself somewhat in sympathy with the object of the motion. But unless they got the society, through the Council, to move in the matter, there would be no chance whatever of obtaining that object.

Mr. CALKIN LEWIS (London) said they must all agree with Mr. Phillimore in thinking this certificate duty a gross injustice to the profession which ought to have been abolished long ago. But to get it abolished was quite another thing, and he entirely disagreed with him in thinking that because solicitors were the victims of taxation they should endeavour to get another branch of the profession saddled with a similar injustice. He suggested that, whatever they did, they should let the bar alone, to say nothing of the higher dignitaries to whom he had alluded.

A MEMBER asked whether it was at all in order to make such a suggestion at a meeting of solicitors.

The PRESIDENT said he did not think they had anything to do with the bar, but he saw no objection to the motion. He did not think he could allow the judges to be added.

Mr. PHILLIMORE said that was only in his remarks; he did not include the judges in the resolution.

Mr. LESLIE J. WILLIAMS (London) moved, as an amendment, that the Chancellor of the Exchequer should be approached, and should be told the opinion of the society, that they consider the tax unjust, and that the society hoped they would be relieved.

Mr. FORD said he was very sorry to differ from what Mr. Phillimore had said, but he did think they ought to be a little cautious as to what they were about. In the first place, he thought he was right in saying that in consequence of the sum that the solicitors contributed to the public revenue by reason of the certificate duty, a considerable sum was granted out of the public exchequer to the society.

The PRESIDENT: You are not entitled to say "in consequence."

Mr. FORD: Well, I think I am entitled to say the two things are concurrent.

The PRESIDENT: You are entitled to say that.

Mr. FORD said it would follow that if the Revenue were deprived of the sum that came from the certificate duty, the Chancellor of the Exchequer might deprive the society of the amount he gave them to carry on the valuable work of the society. He thought this was a retrograde step.

The PRESIDENT put the amendment: "That the time has arrived when the certificate tax should be abolished."

The amendment having been seconded,

Mr. GRAY, a member of the Council, seriously asked Mr. Leslie Williams to withdraw the amendment on the present occasion. The general body of the profession had had no notice of such a motion being brought forward. If it were brought forward on some other occasion after due notice, and not by way of amendment, it would be quite the proper subject of discussion.

Mr. WILLIAMS said he would bow to the suggestion which had been made.

Mr. GRAY further asked that these subsidiary questions should not be pressed by Mr. Phillimore. They could not seriously go into a motion about taxing barristers, and as to the mode of its collection. These were subordinate questions which might well be left out.

Mr. PHILLIMORE really did not see why the fact of his having drawn in the bar had anything very objectionable about it. He adhered to his resolution.

Mr. FORD asked whether it was not the fact that solicitors for a certain period after admission only paid half the duty.

The PRESIDENT: That is so.

A MEMBER suggested that the motion should be put in sections.

Mr. HARVEY CLIFTON said he would prefer that this somewhat large question should be dealt with at a very much larger meeting, therefore he asked Mr. Phillimore, although he had seconded the resolution, for the purpose of ensuring some discussion, being a matter in which he had for a long time taken a very keen interest, to permit him to withdraw the seconding of the motion.

The PRESIDENT: After this, Mr. Phillimore, I think you would do well to withdraw the motion, and the whole matter will be considered when the resolution comes forward of which I think Mr. Williams intends to give notice.

Mr. PHILLIMORE withdrew the motion, observing that he was glad to see a very different feeling in the profession, as indicated to-day, from what there had been before.

#### REMOVING NAMES FROM ROLL.

Mr. FORD asked, in accordance with notice, "Whether the Council propose to take any action in reference to a resolution unanimously passed at a meeting of the society held on the 25th of April, 1902, such resolution having reference to removing names of solicitors from the roll?" He said the resolution was as follows: "That it be referred to the Council to consider and report at the next annual meeting of the society as to simplifying by legislative action the procedure of removing solicitors' names from the roll."

The PRESIDENT said the matter involved in the question was, in point of fact, a return to the original suggestion of the Council that the Discipline Committee should have the power to strike solicitors off the roll, subject to appeal, and if such arrangement could be carried into effect it would no doubt be an improvement, but the Council could only take steps in the matter indicated when a fitting opportunity arose. It would require legislation.

#### ARTICLED CLERKS.

Mr. FORD asked, in accordance with notice, "Whether the Council is of opinion that section 4 of the Solicitors Act, 1843, ought to be amended, so that no solicitor shall have more than one articulated clerk at one and the same time bound by articles of clerkship to serve him; and further, that no solicitor shall be competent to grant such articles of clerkship unless, and until, he has taken out six annual certificates to practise?"

The PRESIDENT said there might be differences of opinion about this matter, but there did not seem to be any particular reason why, under certain circumstances, a solicitor should be restricted to one articulated clerk. Doubtless there might be cases in which it would not be desirable that articles of clerkship should be entered into with a man who had only recently been admitted, but it should be borne in mind that those men often became members of firms of long standing, which contained two or more partners. It did not seem reasonable to exclude an articulated clerk from being taken in those circumstances, simply because the man to whom he was actually articulated had been only recently admitted.

#### NOMINATION TO THE COUNCIL.

Mr. FORD moved, in accordance with notice: "That is the opinion of this meeting the question of the suitability of members of the society to serve as members of the Council is a matter for the general body of the members of the society, rather than for those who are already members of the Council; and this meeting is of opinion that those candidates for election on the Council who are nominated by the President and Vice-President of the society are apt to secure an unfair advantage over other equally suitable candidates not so nominated, and therefore this practice ought to be discontinued." He said he thought this house list for the annual meeting was a bad system. The members were quite capable of deciding whether A. or B. was suitable without being told by the names of the President and Vice-President appearing as the nominators. It meant "That is the man we want, and the other man is the man we do not want." He appealed to the Council to leave the members to form their own opinion, and to do away with this wretched system of the house list. He did not know that the house list system was in vogue in any other institution.

The PRESIDENT: Do you really make that statement seriously, that it is not done in any other institution? I am not expressing any opinion.

Mr. FORD said that he was not aware that it was done in any other institution.

Mr. W. A. PLUNKETT (London) seconded the motion.

Mr. TAYLOR said that if Mr. Ford's principles were carried to a legitimate conclusion they would really mean depriving the President and Vice-President and the members of the Council of the right of nominating any one. They had as much right to nominate candidates, surely, as any individual member, and if the line were drawn that they should not nominate more than one member that would not be desirable. Surely the President and Vice-President, in close touch with the solicitors of England, knew the men who were desirable. Surely they had as much right to nominate as a private member.

Mr. H. J. JOHNSON (London), a member of the Council, asked Mr. Ford to explain how the names of the President and Vice-President prevented members from exercising their own judgment. He did not see how they prevented a man from doing so. According to Mr. Ford,

it was a most useful thing, because the members would then know which men not to vote for.

The motion was negatived.

#### EXPULSION OF MEMBERS.

Mr. FORD asked, in accordance with notice: "In what number of cases during the past ten years action had been taken under bye-laws Nos. 11 and 12, and whether, in the opinion of the Council, these bye-laws call for revision, with a view to easier methods for securing the suspension or expulsion of members? Also, how many members of the society during the past five years have been excluded from membership by reason of bankruptcy, or arrangement or composition with creditors?"

The PRESIDENT said he had been informed that during the past ten years no member had been suspended or been excluded by resolution of the society. During the same period nineteen members had been excluded from membership by reason of bankruptcy or arrangement or composition with their creditors.

Mr. PHILLIMORE said he thought that within the last few years members had been excluded.

The PRESIDENT said that was the information which had been put before him by the permanent officials of the society, who were, as a rule, very correct in such matters. Members had been excluded for persistent non-payment of subscription.

#### MEMBERS IN THE CABINET.

Mr. HARVEY CLIFTON had given notice to move: "That this general meeting of the Law Society observes with satisfaction and pleasure the inclusion of two members of the society in the new Cabinet, and tenders its congratulations to the Right Hon. Sir Henry Fowler, M.P., and to the Right Hon. D. Lloyd-George, M.P. That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each member."

The PRESIDENT said he was going to ask Mr. Harvey Clifton to bear with him for a moment. It appeared to him that the resolution was perilously near, or might be perilously near, inviting a political discussion, and they were always most careful to avoid that. Therefore he would ask him to be kind enough not to move the resolution. Of course they were all glad to see any members of the profession rise to eminence, but it seemed to him that not only was this a little belated, a little behind the day, but, on the other ground, which was a more serious one, he would ask him to accept his statement that he thought it perilously near a political question, and, of course, in a matter of this kind they would not desire anything but absolute unanimity.

Mr. HARVEY CLIFTON said that, with the greatest respect for the President's personal judgment, he thought the resolution would be quite outside politics.

The PRESIDENT said that if Mr. Harvey Clifton did not accede to his request he should be sorry. He had simply made the suggestion in the interest of what he considered right and proper.

Mr. WILLIAMS urged Mr. Harvey Clifton to fall in with the President's suggestion, because it would be an extremely unhappy thing supposing that the resolution were put to the vote and not carried.

The PRESIDENT said he would prefer Mr. Harvey Clifton yielding gracefully to the general view.

Mr. HARVEY CLIFTON withdrew the motion.

#### TELEPHONES FOR MEMBERS.

Mr. T. H. ENGALL (London) moved, in accordance with notice: "That this meeting considers it desirable that two additional telephones should be fixed in the building for the use of members."

The PRESIDENT said that the Council were most desirous of carrying out the wishes of the members with regard to affording every possible accommodation, but the House Committee had been into the matter, and they did not see their way to having two additional telephones fixed. If Mr. Engall would be good enough to leave the matter for reconsideration the Council would do the best they could, but he was told by the officials that there were difficulties in the way, and he could not promise that the request would be granted, certainly not forthwith.

Mr. ENGALL said he wanted the feeling of the meeting, because members felt very strongly that there should be more.

The PRESIDENT: I promise you I will look into the matter myself.

Mr. WILLIAMS thought the difficulty might be got over by having some time limit for the use of the telephones.

The PRESIDENT: Yes, that is agreed.

Mr. WILLIAMS said that an unfair use was made of the telephones.

The PRESIDENT: Yes, a good deal might be said about that. I will do what I can.

#### COMMON ROOM.

Mr. PHILLIMORE asked, in accordance with notice: "Why has the Council rescinded the regulation, till lately in force, which limited smoking and the service of coffee and other light refreshments to one portion only of that part of the library which is officially designated as the 'Common Room'?"

The PRESIDENT said that the Common Room was added as part of the new building in pursuance of constant applications made at the general meetings for a room of that description. It was a matter entirely for the members of the society to say whether smoking should be permitted in the room. To limit smoking to one part of the room had been found to be of practically little use, inasmuch as smoking was as much in evidence when confined to one part of the room as it was when allowed throughout the apartment.

Mr. PHILLIMORE said that was not his experience.

The PRESIDENT: I am afraid you must accept that as the answer.

#### SOCIETY'S REGISTER.

Mr. FORD asked, in accordance with notice: "Whether those using the Register of the society should not be required to furnish enough information (in the case of money available for loan by way of mortgage) to enable others who use the said Register to know whether it is worth while to open communication with such advertisers?" He said the complaint was that communications were opened and came to nothing for want of proper information.

The PRESIDENT said that he was informed that the form supplied requested advertisers to specify, in addition to the ordinary particulars, whether the fund was a trust fund or not; whether the fund could be divided, and whether there was any limit as to locality.

Mr. FORD moved a vote of thanks to the President for his able conduct in the chair and for the impartiality which had marked it.

The motion having been adopted, the proceedings terminated.

### Metropolitan Discharged Prisoners' Aid Society.

#### ANNUAL MEETING.

The annual meeting of the Discharged Prisoners' Aid Society, held at Queen's Hall, Langham-place, on Thursday, the 26th ult., took the somewhat unusual form of a concert, at which the Lord Chief Justice president of the society, took the chair, and at the interval usual at such functions delivered an address.

The report stated that during the past year 2,676 prisoners had applied for assistance, 2,093 of whom were assisted. Since its formation the society had dealt with over 26,600 prisoners. Endeavours had been made to assist those prisoners who had wives and families dependent upon them by keeping their homes together between the time of the prisoner's discharge and his obtaining regular employment. The experiment had been extended during the year, and in twenty-nine cases the society had assisted the wives of prisoners, and in some instances during the whole term of imprisonment, and had in this way prevented, to a certain extent, the punishment of the innocent with the guilty. From the experience thus gained the committee were encouraged to adopt this as part of their regular work. They were also endeavouring to work out a scheme for dealing with young lads who, not yet criminals, and without criminal proclivities, were on the verge of drifting into a criminal career, and they appealed to charitably disposed persons individually to take charge of one such lad, procuring him employment and generally taking an interest in him just at the time when he was most amenable to such influence.

The LORD CHIEF JUSTICE said he thought the plan which had been adopted this evening of combining the annual meeting with such delightful music as that to which they had been listening was one which might be followed with advantage by similar societies, and he thought the association might be proud of having inaugurated a movement of the kind. He should like, before speaking of the particular object of the meeting, to thank those ladies and gentlemen who had been so kind as to come forward and help the association with their programme and to give so charming a performance. He had no doubt that most, if not all, of those present were well acquainted with the object of the society, but he desired, as president, to say a few words with reference to the year's work, because the society had been able to make a considerable advance, and he felt that the increased publicity which had been given to it and the extended knowledge of the society's efforts and aims had tended to bring them additional support, and he hoped they would gain further support in the future. On a previous occasion he had pointed out that in 1903 the association had assisted no less than 1,465 discharged prisoners to obtain employment and to commence to regain an honest livelihood, at a comparatively small cost to the society—something like £761—and this year, as the report stated, the income having increased considerably by the aid of additional subscribers, they had been able to assist no less than 2,093 discharged prisoners, at something like the same expense of about £800 or £900. He could not speak in too strong terms of approbation of the aims, objects, and advantages of the society. He was afraid he had said the same thing before at these annual meetings, but it was an observation which anyone speaking on behalf of such a society could not refrain from making. It was part of his duty to go from county to county in England, and his brother judges performed the same duty, and they took the opportunity of visiting the prisons. He invariably made it a point to ask about the Discharged Prisoners' Aid Societies which were working in the various counties, and he was glad to say the report was universal that they were doing a great work. The example set by this society and the other parent societies had been followed, not only in all our great towns, but in all the towns where there were prisons, and the result was that these societies were now the principal agents for enabling criminals to start afresh with some prospect of being more successful in the future. And it was a very pleasant feature of the society's work that to a very large extent those whom they assisted were drawn from what was called the "star" prisoners—that was to say, the first offenders who had not been associated with criminals, and from young offenders who were also first offenders, so that the committee were able to feel that in very many instances, though what the society was able to do was very small, it had been the means of getting those who had temporarily fallen away, sometimes having been exposed to temptation such as none present could imagine, to get back to an honest and healthy mode of life. And he could not tell them the need there was for the extension of this kind of work, he could not exaggerate it in anything he might say. People who had been in prison were necessarily to a certain extent under a cloud. There were employers, and he did not blame

them, who would not look at them and would not take them into their employment, very frequently out of regard to the young people, men and women, who were employed by them. It was not a decision which one could complain of, but the result was that it required persistence, influence, and energy to find employment for many of those who had been unfortunate. There was another aspect of the case, and that was the difficulty which these poor people had in helping themselves. He did not in the least wish to harrow the feelings of his listeners or to tell them of matters which had come within his own experience, which were very heartbreaking at the time when one came across them, but it was a fact that owing to the watchfulness, and proper watchfulness, of the police, it was an extremely difficult thing for a man who had come out of prison to start again with anything like the same prospect of getting work as if he had not unfortunately come within the arm of the law. And while he had spoken of the fact that a large number of those relieved by the society had been drawn from the first offender and the "star" class—that was to say, those who had not been in prison before—there were also not a few men who, the experience of the society shewed, had got tired of prison life and were anxious to come back to an honest living, and those were the men whom it was especially difficult to assist because of their antecedents. There were two other branches of the society's work which were beginning, and which he hoped would be extended very much within the next few years, one of which was the assistance given to the wives and families of prisoners. It was a very hard thing indeed that the innocent should suffer for the guilty, and not infrequently the bread-winner was for a time taken away and there was a difficulty about the home being kept for him to return to it. That was a very important matter, and the society had in twenty-nine cases been able to help the wives and families of those in prison so that they might be saved as much as possible from suffering. One other matter he wished to mention. The society was starting afresh the endeavour to get employment for the younger criminals, and the committee was extremely anxious to find benevolent ladies and gentlemen who would come forward from time to time to help them if it was only to find employment for one lad, which would be an enormous assistance to the committee and to those who had to carry on the work of the society. He earnestly appealed, not for money only, though of course the society wanted money, but he appealed to them to aid the useful work of the society by making it known among their friends and by actually assisting where they were able when the committee had to find employment for those who came out of prison, and by interesting others in this useful work. He knew, all of them knew, how large and increasing were the claims upon the benevolent and charitable, but still he could not help thinking we ought to remember that we were not sent into this world to live entirely for ourselves, not to live alone, but to help one another, and though there were many claims upon us of men and women whom we were very desirous of helping he thought we ought to a certain extent to remember that the more downcast and unfortunate a man might have been the greater was the demand he had on the charitable and benevolent to give him a helping hand. He was very glad to think that by means of getting a larger attendance at this meeting than was the case last year, and far more last year, when the concert was first instituted, than used to be the case, the opportunity for extending the knowledge of the work of the society had increased and augmented. He earnestly appealed to them to do all they could to support the society, and he trusted that whoever might preside at the annual meeting next year might be able to speak of increased funds, increased activity, and increased good done to those who were not able to help themselves.

### The Bar Meeting.

The annual general meeting of the bar was held in the old dining hall of Lincoln's-inn, the SOLICITOR-GENERAL being in the chair.

The SOLICITOR-GENERAL expressed his regret at the absence of his learned leader, the Attorney-General, and all would regret the cause of that absence. Referring to the questions with which the annual report of the council was concerned, he said that one was that of the Long Vacation—a question which, it appeared, would always be with them. The most important work, perhaps, which came before the council was proposed legislation. The statement contained a large list of measures which the council or its committees had considered. He was in a position to certify to the excellence of the services rendered in this respect by the council. The chief item was the effort which was being made to codify the law of marine insurance. Many of the recommendations of the council had now been carried into effect and embodied in forty or fifty amendments. The result was that the Bill was much improved. A body of expert and impartial opinion had been brought to bear on the clauses of the Bill, and the aim, and the result also, had been to simplify and cheapen the law. He had been a good many years in Parliament, and he had never observed any tendency in the legal members to postpone the interests of the public to those of the profession. In the statement there was a paragraph of more than national—more than Imperial—importance relating to the subject of international maritime law. Largely in consequence of the labours of the council, an attempt was being made to compile a code of the maritime law of civilized nations. The Chancelleries of Europe were said to be always at work on some scheme or other for bringing the nations together. But if ever there should be established "The Parliament of Man, the Federation of the World" some of the credit would be due to the General Council of the Bar. Another question was that of prosecutions by chief constables. He heartily concurred with the disapproval expressed of this system by the council. A prosecuting counsel often observed a spirit of discretion and moderation, and did not unduly press, and sometimes abandoned, charges against an accused person,

whereas a constable never exhibited a like consideration. He moved the adoption of the report.

Mr. WARMINGTON, K.C., seconded the motion.

Mr. R. WILKINSON moved an amendment on the portion of the annual statement which had reference to the South London Sessions, and a prolonged discussion ensued. The council had expressed the opinion that the South London Sessions was an open session, but that the members of the bar attending such sessions were at liberty to make such rules among themselves as regarded their mess as they might think proper. The amendment expressed disapproval of this.

The amendment was lost, and the report was adopted.

A vote of thanks to the auditors was passed on the motion of Mr. TINDAL ATKINSON.

Sir ROBERT FINLAY, observing that the bar had often been compared to a trade union, had much pleasure in moving that a hearty vote of thanks should be accorded to the Solicitor-General for presiding.

Mr. WARMINGTON, K.C., in seconding the motion, expressed regret at the absence of Sir Edward Clarke, who had attended every annual meeting from the establishment, more than twenty years ago, of the original bar committee.

The SOLICITOR-GENERAL said that if the bar were a trade union, they were a model to other trade unions, for their rules were passed by common consent, and their conduct was guided by good sense and personal honour. No body of them, for example, would ever think of picketing the Surrey Sessions.

## Law Students' Journal.

### The Law Society.

#### HONOURS EXAMINATION.—MARCH, 1906.

At the Examination for Honours of candidates for admission on the Roll of Solicitors of the Supreme Court, the Examination Committee recommended the following as being entitled to honorary distinction:

##### FIRST CLASS.

[In order of Merit]

FRANCIS MEREDITH CAPORN, who served his clerkship with Mr. Thomas Henry Wrensted, of the firm of Messrs. Wrensted, Hind, & Roberts, of London.

EDWARD DALES, LL.B. (Lond.), who served his clerkship with Mr. Frederic William Adamson, of Hull.

MICHAEL FREDERICK CAHILL, who served his clerkship with Mr. F. H. Harvey-Samuel, of the firm of Messrs. McKenna & Co., of London.

##### SECOND CLASS.

[In alphabetical order.]

Charles Beamish Blatch, who served his clerkship with Mr. Herbert Blatch, of the firm of Messrs. Goater & Blatch, of Southampton; and Mr. E. Bonnor-Maurice, of the firm of Messrs. Bircham & Co., of London.

Gilbert William Daynes, who served his clerkship with Mr. John William Crook Daynes, of Norwich.

William Bertram Kennett, who served his clerkship with Mr. Thomas Richards, and Mr. Samuel Tonkin, of the firm of Messrs. Cooper & Bake, both of London.

Harold Roberts, who served his clerkship with Mr. William Thomas Baker, of Bridgwater.

Horace Wilfrid Skinner, who served his clerkship with Mr. Henry Cane, of the firm of Messrs. Colbatch, Clark, & Cane, of Brighton; and Mr. Henry Ward, of the firm of Messrs. Rooks, Spiers, Wales & Ward, of London.

William Aitchison Young, who served his clerkship with Mr. John Knox Weatherhead, of the firm of Messrs. Sanderson & J. K. Weatherhead, of Berwick-on-Tweed; and Messrs. E. Flux, Leadbitter, & Neighbour, of London.

##### THIRD CLASS.

[In alphabetical order.]

Charles Taylor Cooke, who served his clerkship with Mr. Frederick Cooke, of Crews; Mr. John Henry Cooke, of Winaford; and Messrs. Bask, Mellor, & Norris, of London.

William George, who served his clerkship with Mr. Leopold C. Harvey, of the firm of Messrs. Cathrop & Leopold Harvey, of Spalding.

Henry Robert Hart, who served his clerkship with Mr. Robert Pulsford Hart, of London.

Walter Fitzgerald Hill, B.A. (Oxon.), who served his clerkship with Mr. Wilfred Godden, of the firm of Messrs. Godden, Son, & Holme, of London.

Charles James Mackie Whittaker, who served his clerkship with Messrs. Hallett & Martin, of Southampton; and Mr. Percy James Nicholls, of London.

Leslie Williams, who served his clerkship with Mr. Walter William Brodie, of the firm of Messrs. Brodie & Walton, of Llanelly.

The Council of the Law Society have accordingly given class certificates and awarded the following prizes of books:

To Mr. Caporn and Mr. Dales—the Clement's-inn prize—value about £10; and the Daniel Reardon Prize—value about 20 guineas; and to Mr. Caporn—the John Mackrell prize—value about £12.

To Mr. Cahill—the New-inn prize—value 5 guineas.

The Council have given class certificates to the candidates in the second and third classes.

Seventy-five candidates gave notice for the examination.

## Law Students' Societies.

**LAW STUDENTS' DEBATING SOCIETY.**—May 1.—Chairman, Mr. E. B. Ames. —The subject for debate was: "That the case of *Ridson Iron and Locomotive Works v. Furness* (1905, 1 K. B. 49) (Company formed for purpose of trading abroad—Conflict of laws was) wrongly decided." Mr. Neville Tebbutt opened in the affirmative, Mr. W. E. Singleton seconded in the affirmative; Mr. C. P. Blackwell opened in the negative, Mr. A. C. Dowding seconded in the negative. The following members also spoke: Messrs. Adams, Blagden, and Pleadwell. The motion was lost by six votes.

## Legal News.

## Changes in Partnerships.

## Dissolutions.

**THOMAS ARUNDEL ALDRIDGE and THOMAS REUBEN THOMPSON**, solicitors (Aldridge & Thompson), Bridgwater and Highbridge. Oct. 7.

**HENRY COOKE and ERNEST REGINALD ACTON**, solicitors and notaries (Isaac Cooke, Sons, & Acton), Bristol. March 31. So far as regards the said Ernest Reginald Acton: the said Henry Cooke will continue to carry on business at the above address under the style or firm of Isaac Cooke & Sons. [Gazette, April 27.]

## General.

Mr. Justice Bigham has fixed the next sitting of the Railway and Canal Commission Court for Thursday, the 24th inst., at the Royal Courts of Justice.

It is announced that the King has granted the rank and dignity of Counsel to his Majesty to John Alexander Reid, Esq., advocate, member of the Scottish Bar.

Mr. Justice Johnson, of the Irish King's Bench, is, says the *Westminster Gazette*, now the *doyen* of the English and Irish judiciary in point of years. He is in his seventy-seventh year, and has been on the bench since 1883.

The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council resumed their sittings on Tuesday, after the Easter vacation. Their list of business includes, says the *Times*, 11 appeals—viz., from Madras two, Oudh two, and Central Provinces of India, Bombay, Haidarabad, Transvaal, New South Wales, China and Corea, and Victoria one each. There is also a patent case for decision. Six judgments in appeals heard before the vacation are set down for delivery.

The following days have been fixed by Mr. Justice Ridley for holding the summer assizes on the latter portion of the South-Eastern Circuit:—Hertford.—Wednesday, June 27; no civil business before Friday, June 29. Lewes.—Saturday, June 30; civil business not before Thursday, July 5. Maidstone.—Tuesday, July 10; civil business not before Saturday, July 14. Guildford.—Friday, July 20; civil business not before Tuesday, July 24.

A ball will be given in the Inner Temple Hall, by permission of the Treasurer and Benchers, on Tuesday, the 22nd of May, in aid of the Inns of Court Mission. The ball is under the patronage of the Lord Chancellor, the Earl and Countess of Halsbury, the Lord Chief Justice of England, and many distinguished members of the legal profession. Application for tickets may be made to Mr. Rayner Goddard, 2, Paper-buildings, Temple, and to Miss Kennedy, hon. secretary, 23, Phillimore-gardens, W.

At the meeting on the 27th ult., of justices of the County of London for the transaction of county business the Parliamentary committee presented a report on the Criminal Appeal Bill lately introduced in the House of Lords. The report stated, says the *Times*, that while they agree that some legislation may be desirable with a view to strengthening the power of appeal, your committee are of opinion that the Bill as drawn contains provisions far in excess of what is required in this direction, and that the proposed measure is not an adequate and reasonable improvement upon the present system. The following appear to your committee to be some of the principal objections to the Bill: (1) To give prisoners the right to appeal on every point of law or fact or as to the sentence will probably result in the lessening of the sense of responsibility which is felt by every jurymen in the consideration and finding of his verdict. (2) Inasmuch as the punishment cannot be increased and no costs are to be allowed on either side it is practically certain that every prisoner will appeal, whether he has any real or substantial grounds of appealing or not, seeing that he may gain by the operation, while he is left in none the worse position if he fails. Your committee need hardly point out that this unrestricted right of appeal would bring about such a condition of things as would result, as regards London, in the complete disorganization of the criminal business of the county. Over 2,500 prisoners are dealt with by the County of London Sessions every year, and this number is steadily increasing. It appears to your committee that assuming, as is probable, that the majority of the prisoners convicted will appeal on some one or other of the grounds open to them, the Court of Criminal Appeal would find itself unable to cope with the cases from the County of London Sessions alone. Mr. McConnell said that he thought the Bill an insult to the long-established trial by jury. It undermined the whole administration of justice on which we had been taught to rely, and it held in abeyance an immediate sentence passed for a serious offence, and postponed it indefinitely. The report was unanimously adopted by the seventy magistrates present.

It is announced that the King has been pleased, upon the recommendation of the Secretary for Scotland, to appoint a Royal Commission to inquire and report upon the expediency of instituting in Scotland a system of registration of title. The Commission is to be composed of the following persons: Lord Dunedin of Stenton, Lord President of the Court of Session (chairman), Sir Samuel Chisholm, Bart., C. Fortescue Brickdale, Esq., J. Smith Clark, Esq., S.S.C., W. J. Dundas, Esq., W.S., R. C. Munro Ferguson, Esq., M.P., J. Hope Finlay, Esq., W.S., and Professor Neil Kennedy, Advocate, LL.D.

Judges sometimes differ, says a writer in the *Globe*, on very simple points. Mr. Justice Sutton lately refused to put a certain case in the London jury list, on the ground that the list was practically no longer in existence. The Court of Appeal, after consulting the Lord Chief Justice, found that the London list was still open to suitors, and allowed the appeal against Mr. Justice Sutton's decision. The Lord Chief Justice informed the Court of Appeal that "if a case was in the London list it would be tried by a class of jurymen better qualified to deal with commercial matters than if the case was in the Middlesex list." This, no doubt, will be flattering to City men, but whether they will be wholly grateful for the compliment is another matter. It may encourage a greater demand upon their services as jurymen.

An act of unprecedented audacity has, says the Paris correspondent of the *Daily Mail*, just been committed at Châlons-sur-Marne by a prisoner who was awaiting trial in the prison of that town on charges of assault and robbery and of attempted murder. Not only has the man succeeded in escaping from prison by means of a key which he manufactured, but after leaving the prison he made his way to the law courts in the town, got through the window, and succeeded in entering the private room of the Juge d'Instruction, or magistrate, who had his case in hand. Here he broke open all the drawers until he discovered the papers referring to his own case, and got possession of the letters, depositions, and documents concerning himself, as well as the various articles found on him at the time of his arrest, such as his revolver, his burglar's tools, &c.; and then, depositing a piece of bread, his prison handkerchief, and his prison slippers on the judge's table, he decamped.

An important award was given on Tuesday, says the *Times*, by Mr. Walter C. Ryde, barrister, to whom was referred the appeal of the Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Co. against the assessment committee of the Salford Union and the overseers of Salford. Under the award all lines in goods yards and stations which are commonly called sidings, on which the loading and unloading of goods wagons is carried on, are held to be part of the railway lines which are generally known as running lines. These had hitherto been rated on structural value, and that value will, under Mr. Ryde's decision, disappear from the rateable value. In the Salford case Mr. Ryde's award applies to nine miles of sidings, and the reduction on account of them amounts to a rateable value of about £3,500 a year. It is calculated that the rateable value of railways amounts to £16,000,000 in England and Wales, and a reduction of about one-fifteenth will be effected by the award. The reduction of rates on English railways will be not less than £250,000 per annum, a sum equal to 1 per cent on the amount available for dividend. Since 1899 the rating authorities have increased their claims on railway companies over £1,000,000 per annum.

A meeting of law clerks was held at Clifford's-inn hall on Monday. Mr. B. A. Johnson, hon. secretary, announced the receipt of a letter from the Lord Chief Justice asking for a prospectus of the proposed association to be forwarded to him and stating that he would be pleased to do all in his power to further its interests. Mr. W. Willis, who presided, said that law clerks had no corporate association which could voice their aspirations or protect their interests. They were generally regarded with suspicion and sometimes with a considerable amount of contempt, and appointments in the Law Courts and other institutions pertaining to their profession were, as a rule, not filled up from their ranks. Their desire was to form an association with the object of removing the prejudices, and of improving their position generally in regard to public appointments and other matters. It was not proposed to form anything in the nature of a trade union, or to work in antagonism to any other body. Mr. Engleman proposed: "That an association be formed, to be called the London Law Clerks' Association, and that its objects be (a) to protect and advance the interests of law clerks as may be found desirable; (b) to encourage the study of law and the acquisition of knowledge connected therewith by means of lectures, discussions, or otherwise; (c) to establish a situation bureau; (d) to promote social intercourse between the members of the association; (e) to establish and maintain a library of legal and other works for the use of members; and (f) to extend the objects of the association in any way that may appear desirable." Mr. Cresswell seconded the motion, which was supported by Mr. Bertram Jacobs, barrister-at-law, and others, and unanimously adopted. It was further resolved that membership of the association should be open to all clerks employed by any solicitor or barrister (or in any court of law or by any legal institution), and a committee was appointed to carry out the objects.

**TO EXECUTORS.**—VALUATIONS FOR PROBATE.—Messrs. Watherston & Son, Jewellers, Goldsmiths, and Silversmiths to H.M. The King, 6, Vigo-street (leading from Regent-street to Burlington-gardens and Bond-street), London, W., Value, Purchase, or Arrange Collections of Plate or Jewels for Family Distribution, late of Pall Mall East, adjoining the National Gallery.—[ADVT.]

**FIXED INCOMES.**—Houses and Residential Flats can now be furnished on a new System of Deferred Payments especially adapted for those with fixed incomes who do not wish to disturb investments. Selection from the largest stock in the World. Everything legibly marked in plain figures. Maple & Co. (Limited), Tottenham Court-road, London, W.—[ADVT.]

## Court Papers.

### Supreme Court of Judicature.

#### ROTA OF REGISTRARS IN ATTENDANCE ON

Date.	EMERGENCY ROTA.	APPEAL COURT No. 2.	MR. JUSTICE KEEWICH.	MR. JUSTICE FARWELL.
Monday, May.....	7 Mr. Carrington	Mr. King	Mr. R. Leach	Mr. Pemberton
Tuesday, .....	8 Beal	Farmer	Godfrey	Jackson
Wednesday, .....	9 Jackson	King	R. Leach	Pemberton
Thursday, .....	10 Pemberton	Farmer	Godfrey	Jackson
Friday, .....	11 Godfrey	King	R. Leach	Pemberton
Saturday, .....	12 R. Leach	Farmer	Godfrey	Jackson

  

Date	MR. JUSTICE BUCKLEY.	MR. JUSTICE JONES.	MR. JUSTICE SWINER.	MR. JUSTICE WARRINGTON.
Monday, May.....	7 Mr. Greswell	Mr. Beal	Mr. W. Leach	Mr. Church
Tuesday, .....	8 Church	Carrington	Theod	Greswell
Wednesday, .....	9 Greswell	Beal	W. Leach	Theod
Thursday, .....	10 Church	Carrington	Theod	W. Leach
Friday, .....	11 Greswell	Beal	W. Leach	Farmer
Saturday, .....	12 Church	Carrington	Theod	King

### COURT OF APPEAL.

#### EASTER SITTINGS, 1906.

(Continued from p. 425.)

#### FROM THE KING'S BENCH DIVISION.

(Interlocutory List.)

To be mentioned.

The Swansea Harbour Trustees (Applts) v The Assessment Committee of the Swansea Union and ors (Repts) appl of appts from order of the Lord Chief Justice and Justices Lawrence and Ridley (Judgt given on April 7) (Heard before Vaughan Williams, Stirling, and Fletcher Moulton, L.J.J.)

#### FROM THE KING'S BENCH DIVISION.

For Hearing.

(Final List.)

1905.

In the Matter of the Devonport Corp'n Water Act, 1902, and In the Matter of an Arbitration between The Devonport Water Co and the Mayor, &c, of Devonport appl of the Devonport Water Co from judgt of Mr Justice Phillimore, dated Jan 24, 1905 (special case, part heard, remitted to arbitration) Feb 1

In re an Arbitration between the Devonport Water Co and the Devonport Corp'n appl of the Devonport Corp'n from judgt of Mr Justice Phillimore, dated Jan 24, 1905 (special case) part heard Feb 2

The Southern Coal Co of New South Wales Id v G S Yuill & Co Id appl of defts from judgment of Mr Justice Warrington, dated Jan 31, 1905, without a jury, Middlesex Feb 7

Chapman v Waring & Gillow Id appl of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Darling, dated Feb 1, 1905, with a special jury, Middlesex, and cross-notice by plttf, dated March 24, 1905 part heard (s o) Feb 16

Mayor, &c of Norwich v Norwich Electric Tramways Co appl of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Phillimore, dated July 13, 1904, without a jury, Middlesex Aug 12, 1904 (restored Jan 11, 1906)

Lancaster & Cunningham Id v Bloomer and ors appl of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Darling, dated Feb 16, 1905, with a special jury, Middlesex Feb 25

Greaves v Curtis, Gardner, & Co and ors appl of defts Henderison, Murray, & Co and Shepherd from judgt of Mr Justice Darling, dated Feb 23, 1905, with a special jury, Middlesex March 7

Simpson City Assets Co Id (and Quinlan liquidator of the said Co) v Griffin appl of deft from judgt of Mr Justice Jelf, dated March 9, 1905, with a common jury, Middlesex March 17

Spilbury v Ward & Lennon appl of plttf from judgt of Mr Justice Warrington, dated March 9, 1905, without a jury, Middlesex March 17

Waite v Jennings appl of deft from judgt of Mr Justice Darling, dated March 18, 1905, without a jury, Middlesex March 23

Palethorpe v The Home Brewery Co appl of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Farwell, dated March 1, 1905, Middlesex March 27

Stuckey v Hooke appl of deft from judgt of Mr Justice Warrington, dated March 20, 1905, without a jury, Middlesex March 30

Geary, Walker, & Co Id v Walter Lawrence & Son appl of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Kennedy, dated March 28, 1905, without a jury, Middlesex April 6

Hickingbottom v O'Gram appl of deft from judgt of Mr Justice Ridley, dated March 30, 1905, without a jury, Leeds April 7

Rumboll v Bunting appl of plttf from judgt of Mr Justice Channell, dated March 11, 1905, without a jury, Middlesex April 12

The Agricultural Holdings, England, Acts, 1883 to 1900 In the Matter of an Arbitration between John Smith (Tenant) and the Duke of Devonshire (Landlord) appl of J Smith from judgt of His Honour the Judge of the Court of Middlesex, Brentford, dated April 7, 1905 April 14

Weeks v Weeks appl of plttf from judgt of Mr Justice Lawrence, dated Feb 22, 1905, without a jury, Bristol April 17

Guardians, &c, of Southwark Union v Guardians, &c, of the City of London appl of The Southwark Guardians from judgt of The Lord Chief Justice and Justices Kennedy and Ridley, dated April 12, 1905 April 19

London and North Western Ry Co v Jones appl of deft from judgt of Mr Justice Walton, dated Dec 20, 1904, without a jury, Chester April 26

Lumsden v The Shipcote Land Co appl of plttf from judgt of Mr Justice Ridley, dated March 2, 1905, with a special jury, Newcastle on Tyne May 1

Woolwich Union (Applts) v Fulham Guardians (Repts) appl of appts from judgt of the Lord Chief Justice and Justices Kennedy and Ridley, dated April 13, 1905 May 3

Carlton (trading as E Carlton & Co) v The Camberwell Palace Varieties appl of plttf from judgt of Mr Justice Grantham, dated May 2, 1905, without a jury, Middlesex May 16

Weiner v Smith and anr Same v Gill and ors appl of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Bray, dated April 19, 1905, without a jury, Middlesex May 23

In re an Arbitration between the Council of the Administrative County of Durham and the Mayor, &c, of the County Borough of West Hartlepool appl of the Mayor, &c, of West Hartlepool from judgt of Mr Justice Channell, dated May 10, 1905 (special case), and cross-notice by County of Durham, dated June 3, 1905 May 24

The King on the relation of William James (Applicant) v Elizabeth Melladew, Executrix (Rept) appl of applicant from judgt of the Lord Chief Justice and Justices Kennedy and Ridley, dated May 15, 1905 May 24

Clark v The London General Omnibus Co Id appl of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Darling, dated May 11, 1905, with a common jury, Middlesex May 29

Farrington Works, &c, Cold v Kelly appl of deft from judgt of Mr Justice Channell, dated May 17, 1905, without a jury, Middlesex May 30

Felton v Wharrie appl of plttf from judgt of Mr Justice Darling, dated May 29, 1905, jury discharged, Middlesex (security ordered) June 1

Lloyd's Bank v Medway (Upper) Navigation Co appl of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Channell, dated May 19, 1905, without a jury, Middlesex June 3

Lewis v Baker appl of plttf from judgt of Mr Justice Jelf, dated May 23, 1905, without a jury, London June 6

In re Hulbert Aldridge, gentleman, solr, &c (expte G Beswick-Darley) appl of G Beswick-Darley from judgt of Mr Justice Jelf, dated June 5, 1905 June 7

Swanley Coal Co v Denton (Gillespie, clmt) appl of clmt from judgt of the Lord Chief Justice and Justices Kennedy and Ridley, dated May 31, 1905 June 7

Brinsmead & Goddard v Ellis appl of plttf from judgt of Mr Justice Jelf, dated May 17, 1905, without a jury, Middlesex June 7

Cowley v Whitmore appl of plttf from judgt of Mr Justice Darling, dated May 30, 1905, with a common jury, Middlesex June 8

Grunnell v Welch appl of plttf from judgt of the Lord Chief Justice and Justices Kennedy and Ridley, dated May 26, 1905 June 8

Everall v Brown appl of plttf from judgt of the Lord Chief Justice and Justices Kennedy and Ridley, dated May 22, 1905 June 9

Key v Meath Rural District Council appl of defts from judgt of the Lord Chief Justice and Justices Kennedy and Ridley, dated May 24, 1905 June 9

Walker (widow) v Smith and anr appl of defts from judgt of The Lord Chief Justice and Justices Kennedy and Ridley, dated May 26, 1905 June 14

Capel & Co v A E Cave (a married woman) W F Cave, clmt appl of plttfs from judgt of the Lord Chief Justice and Justices Kennedy and Ridley, dated May 30, 1905 June 14

Devonald v Rosser & Sons appl of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Jelf, dated June 6, 1905, without a jury, Middlesex June 15

The Temperley Steam Shipping Co v Smales, Eeles, & Co and ors appl of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Channell, dated April 10, 1905 (Commercial List) June 15

T W Davies (Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Estate of W Watson, a Bankrupt) v Petrie (widow) appl of deft from judgt of The Lord Chief Justice and Justices Kennedy and Ridley, dated June 8, 1905 June 17

Kershaw v Evans and anr appl of defts from judgt of The Lord Chief Justice and Justices Kennedy and Ridley, dated May 30, 1905 June 20

Griffin & Sons Id v Vautin & Joll appl of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Bigham, dated May 31, 1905, without a jury, Middlesex (security ordered) June 28

Lowe v Dorling & Son appl of defts from judgt of The Lord Chief Justice and Justices Kennedy and Ridley, dated June 20, 1905 July 4

Sheppard v Bond appl of plttf from judgt of Mr Justice Warrington, dated March 21, 1905, without a jury, Middlesex July 5

Phoenix Assee Co Id v Spooner appl of deft from judgt of Mr Justice Bigham, dated June 3, 1905, without a jury, Middlesex July 5

The British and South American Steam Navigation Co Id v The British and Foreign Marine Insee Co Id appl of plttfs from judgt of Mr Justice Channell, dated March 28, 1905, without a jury, Middlesex July 6

Bond and ors v The Federal Steam Navigation Co Id appl of plttfs from judgt of Mr Justice Channell, dated April 13, 1905, without a jury, Middlesex July 13

Callow v Weaver appl of defts from judgt of Mr Justice A T Lawrence, dated May 25, 1905 July 18

Fieldings v McCulloch and Wife appl of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Ridley, dated June 3, 1905, without a jury, Middlesex July 18

The Wardens and Commonalty of the Mystery of Goldsmiths of the City of London v William Wyatt appl of plttfs from judgt of Mr Justice Channell, dated July 6, 1905 July 18

Hecht and anr v The Egyptian and Soudan Agency Id appl of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Channell, dated June 29, 1905, without a jury, Middlesex July 21

- Kemp v Baerselman appl of debt from judgt of Mr Justice Channell, dated July 14, 1905, without a jury, Middlesex July 24
- Gray v The Oxford Id appl of plttf from judgt of Mr Justice Phillimore, dated July 14, 1905, without a jury, Middlesex July 25
- North London Ry Co v London and India Docks Co appl of plttfs from order of Mr Justice Walton, dated July 11, 1905, without a jury, Middlesex July 27
- J Lang v G E Heyl-Dia appl of debt from judgt of Mr Justice Channell, dated July 7, 1905, without a jury, Middlesex July 28
- North-Eastern 100a Steamship Assoc v The Red S Steamship Co Id appl of debts from judgt of Mr Justice Channell, dated July 1, 1905, without a jury, Middlesex July 29
- Bede Steam Shipping Co v The River Wear Commissioners appl of debts from judgt of Mr Justice Jelf, dated July 18, 1905, without a jury, Durham July 29
- Edwards v The London, Edinburgh, and Glasgow Assoc Co Id appl of plttf from judgt of Mr Justice Darling, dated May 8, 1905, jury discharged, Middlesex Aug 1
- Wild v The English Sewing Cotton Co Id appl of plttf from judgt of Mr Justice Walton, dated July 19, 1905, jury discharged, Salford Aug 1
- Waters (trading as F S Waters & Co) v Gallagher & Co appl of plttf from judgt of The Lord Chief Justice, dated July 21, 1905, Middlesex Aug 2
- Bridget Garry (Wife of Thomas Gerald Garry) v Slatter appl of debt from judgt of Mr Justice Ridley, dated July 22, 1905 Aug 5
- Ross v Ellis appl of plttf from judgt of Mr Justice A T Lawrence, dated Aug 2, 1905 Aug 10
- May and anr v Eiloart appl of plttfs from judgt of Mr Justice Lawrance, dated July 29, 1905, Middlesex Aug 12
- Sales Co Id v David Jones & Co appl of plttfs from judgt of Mr Justice A T Lawrence, dated Aug 10, 1905, without a jury, Middlesex Aug 15
- Austin Friars SS Co Id (applicants) v Strack and L'ors (respts) appl of applicants from judgt of Justices Kennedy and R. J. y, dated May 29, 1905 Aug 17
- Same v Strack appl of applicants from judgt of Justices Kennedy and Ridley, dated May 29, 1905 Aug 17
- The Urban District Council of Wood Green (applicants) v Louis Joseph (respt) appl of applicants from judgt of The Lord Chief Justice and Justices Lawrance and Ridley, dated Aug 3, 1905 Aug 22
- Mason Id v Lovatt appl of plttf from judgt of The Lord Chief Justice and Justices Lawrance and Ridley, dated Aug 10, 1905 Aug 22
- Bayley v Smith appl of debt from judgt of Mr Justice Grantham, dated Aug 11, 1905, without a jury, Leeds Aug 23
- Payton and anr v Clarke and anr appl of plttfs from judgt of Mr Justice Wills, dated Aug 11, 1905, without a jury, Birmingham Sept 2
- Moram, Galloway, & Co v Uzielli and ors appl of plttfs from judgt of Mr Justice Walton, dated Aug 11, 1905, without a jury, Middlesex Sept 11
- French v Howie and Wife appl of debt W J Howie from order of The Lord Chief Justice and Justices Kennedy and Jelf, dated June 27, 1905 Sept 26
- Akuebolaget and ors v Ritsen & Co appl of plttfs from judgt of Mr Justice Bray, dated Aug 3, 1905, without a jury, Middlesex Oct 14
- Noirit v Moore appl of plttf from judgt of Mr Justice Wills, dated Aug 7, 1905, without a jury, Birmingham Oct 15
- Viscount Boyne v Harper appl of debt from judgt of Mr Justice Jelf, dated July 19, 1905, without a jury, Durham Oct 19
- The Mayor, &c., of the Borough of Wednesbury v The Lodge Holes Colliery Coal Id appl of plttfs from judgt of Mr Justice Jelf, dated May 36, 1905, jury discharged, Birmingham Oct 21
- Cheshire v Price and anr appl of debts from judgt of Mr Justice Darling, dated July 28, 1905, without a jury, Birmingham Oct 23
- Dowsett and ors v Ramuz appl of debts from judgt of Mr Justice Phillimore, dated Aug 8, 1905, without a jury, Middlesex Nov 1
- Kearns v Brown appl of debt from judgt of Mr Justice Bray, dated Nov 1, 1905, with a common jury, Middlesex Nov 9
- West Riding of Yorkshire Rivers Board v Robinson Bros appl of debts from judgt of The Lord Chief Justice and Justices Wills and Darling, dated Nov 3, 1905 Nov 14
- The China Mutual Steam Navigation Co Id v Van Laun & Co appl of debts from judgt of Mr Justice Bigham, dated Nov 4, 1905, without a jury, Middlesex Nov 14
- Abyssinian Exploration Parent Co Id v Evans appl of plttfs from judgt of Mr Justice Darling, dated Nov 4, 1905, without a jury, Middlesex Nov 20
- Wiltshire v Telfer appl of debt from judgt of The Lord Chief Justice and Justices Wills and Darling, dated Oct 30, 1905 Nov 21
- Gibson and ors v Payne and ors appl of plttfs from judgt of Mr Justice A T Lawrence, dated Nov 10, 1905, without a jury, Middlesex Nov 25
- Thomas Smalles & Son v Hans Deesen & Co appl of debt from judgt of Mr Justice Channell, dated Nov 2, 1905, without a jury, Middlesex Nov 27
- J & C G Bolinder's Mekanska Verkskade Aktiebolag v The Putna Forests and Saw Mills Co Id appl of debts from judgt of Mr Justice Channell, dated Nov 9, 1905, without a jury, Middlesex Dec 6
- Seal v Hoffman appl of debt from judgt of Mr Justice Warrington, dated Nov 24, 1905, without a jury, Middlesex Dec 7
- Kunisch v Gordan appl of plttf from judgt of Mr Justice Warrington, dated Nov 24, 1905 Dec 8
- Henderson v Arthur appl of plttf from judgt of The Lord Chief Justice, dated Nov 13, 1905, without a jury, Middlesex Dec 9
- In re an Arbitration between the Exors of S A D Eden and James Jolcey & Co Id and The North Eastern Ry Co appl of the North Eastern Ry Co from judgt of Mr Justice Bigham, dated Nov 28, 1905 (special case) Dec 11
- Bothamley v Rowe & Williams appl of debt Williams from judgt of Mr Justice Warrington, dated Dec 1, 1905, without a jury, Middlesex Dec 14
- Schrader v Bell, Harrison, & Co Id appl of debts from judgt of Mr Justice Channell, dated Oct 28, 1905, without a jury, Middlesex Dec 15
- Schultze v Same appl of defendants from judgment of Mr Justice Channell, dated Oct 28, 1905, without a jury, Middlesex Dec 15
- The National Federation of Fruit and Potato Trades Associations (Incorporated) v The Great Northern Ry Co and ors (Railway and Canal Commission) appl of plttfs from judgt of Mr Justice Bigham, The Right Hon Sir F Peel and The Hon A E Gathorne-Hardy, dated Dec 7, 1905 Dec 21
- In the Matter of M C Bradley and her Creditors Porter (Appl't) v Leaver and ors (Respts) appl of applt from order of Mr Justice Phillimore, dated Dec 7, 1905 Dec 21
- Davies (Appl't) v Seisdon Union Assessment Committee of the Parish Council of Kinver (Respts) appl of respts from judgt of The Lord Chief Justice and Justices Lawrance and Ridley, dated Dec 14, 1905 Dec 23
- American Trading Co v Schouten appl of debt from judgt of Mr Justice Channell, dated Nov 25, 1905, without a jury, Middlesex Dec 23
- Benson v Moneyweight Co (1905) Id appl of debt from judgt of Mr Justice Channell, dated Dec 13, 1905, without a jury, Middlesex Dec 29
- Maple & Co (Paris) Id (Appl'ts) v the Commissioners of Inland Revenue (Respts) appl of respts (Revenue Side) from judgt of Mr Justice Walton, dated Dec 8, 1905 (advanced for first week of Easter Sittings) Dec 30
- 1906.
- Great Central Ry Co (appl'ts) v The Assessment Committee of the Banbury Union (respts) appl of respts from judgt of Mr Justice Lawrance and Mr Justice Ridley, dated Dec 14, 1905 Jan 1
- Montgomery v Hutchins and anr appl of plttf from judgt of Mr Justice Bray, dated Dec 21, 1905, special jury, W D Div Co of Lancaster Jan 1
- Blackpool and Fleetwood Tramway Co (appl'ts) v Thornton Urban District Council (respts) appl of applts from judgt of The Lord Chief Justice and Justices Lawrance and Ridley, dated Dec 13, 1905 Jan 4
- Talbot v Blindell and ors appl of debts other than Blindell and debt co from judgt of Mr Justice Walton, dated Dec 11, 1905 Jan 5
- Bywaters & Son v Curnick & Co and anr appl of debts from judgt of Mr Justice Bigham, dated Nov 15, 1905, without a jury, Middlesex Jan 9
- London and North-Western Ry Co (Appl'ts) v The Assessment Committee of the Amptill Union and ors (Respts) appl from judgt of The Lord Chief Justice and Justices Lawrance and Ridley, dated Dec 15, 1905 Jan 11
- Fletcher v Mayor, &c., and the Corp'n, &c., of Birkenhead appl from judgt of Mr Justice Bray, dated Dec 21, 1905, without a jury, Liverpool Jan 11
- Sibery (Appl't) v Connelly (Respt) appl from judgt of The Lord Chief Justice and Justices Lawrance and Ridley, dated Dec 18, 1905 Jan 11
- The Ystradgwyd and Pontypridd Main Sewage Board (Appl'ts) v Bensted, Surveyor of Taxes (Respt) appl of Applts (Revenue Side) from judgt of Mr Justice Walton, dated Dec 30, 1905 Jan 13
- Lumley & Lumley v Rome appl of debt in person from judgt of Mr Justice Walton, dated Nov 13, 1905, without a jury, Middlesex Jan 22
- Speyer Bros (Appl'ts) v The Commissioners of Inland Revenue (Respts) appl of respts from judgt of Mr Justice Walton, dated Dec 18, 1905 Jan 23
- A A Smith and G N Fuller and ors (Appl'ts) v G E Couzens and ors (Respts) appl of applts from judgt of The Lord Chief Justice and Justices Ridley and Darling, dated Jan 15, 1906 Jan 29
- Benton v Lowe appl of plttf from judgt of Mr Justice Warrington (additional judge), dated Nov 29, 1905, with a jury, Middlesex Jan 31
- Young v The Joint Burial Committee of the Parishes of Kingston on Thames, &c appl of plttf from judgt of Mr Justice Channell, dated Dec 21, 1905, without a jury, Middlesex Feb 3
- Bullock v The London General Omnibus Co Id and ors appl of debts from judgt of Mr Justice Bray, dated Jan 26, 1906, and a common jury, Middlesex Feb 6
- Burke v Geminiani appl of plttf from judgt of Mr Justice Channell, dated Dec 21, 1905, without a jury, Middlesex Feb 20
- Mayor, &c., of the Met Boro' of Lambeth v South London Electric Supply Corp'n Id appl of plttfs from judgt of Mr Justice Bigham, dated Nov 16, 1905, without a jury, Middlesex Feb 21
- Ashbee v Rollins appl of plttf from judgt of Mr Justice Grantham, dated Dec 20, 1905, without a jury, Middlesex Feb 24
- Tozeland v The Guardians of the Poor of the West Ham Union appl of debt from judgt of The Lord Chief Justice and Justices Ridley and Darling, dated Feb 14, 1906 Feb 24
- The Guardians of the Gloucester Union by Walter George Williams, their Relieving Officer v The Gloucester Co-operative and Industrial Soc Id appl of plttfs from judgt of The Lord Chief Justice and Justice Ridley and Darling, dated Feb 15, 1906 Feb 26
- Hutton v Ras Steam Shipping Co Id app. of plttf from judgt of The Lord Chief Justice, dated Dec 4, 1905, jury discharged, Middlesex March 1
- The Solidified Oil Coal Id v Benjamin appl of debt from judgt of The Lord Chief Justice and Justices Ridley and Darling, dated Feb 21, 1906 Feb 27
- Dewar v Tasker & Sons Id appl of plttf from judgt of The Lord Chief Justice and Justices Ridley and Darling, dated Feb 16, 1906 March 2
- Bullen v Swan appl of plttf from judgt of Mr Justice Walton, dated Feb 7, 1906, without a jury, Middlesex March 2

Mayer v Swan and anr appl of debt Sachs from judgt of Mr Justice Buckley (additional Judge, &c), dated Feb 19, 1906, without a jury, Middlesex March 5

Express Assoc Corpn ld v C T Bowring & Co ld (sued, &c) appl of pliffs from judgt of Mr Justice Kennedy, dated Dec 5, 1905, without a jury, Middlesex March 5

Hobart v Mayor and Corporation of Southend appl of debts from judgt of Mr Justice Buckley (additional judge, &c.), dated Feb 21, 1906, without a jury, Middlesex (part heard—April 6 stand over) March 5

Lennox v Curzon appl of debt from judgt of Mr Justice Lawrence, dated March 3, 1906, without a jury, Middlesex (to be heard 1st week Easter Sittings, by order) March 8

Biddle v Hart appl of pliff from judgt of The Lord Chief Justice and Justices Ridley and Darling, dated Feb 23, 1906 March 8

Scott v Gordon Lennox appl of debt from judgt of Mr Justice Lawrence, dated March 3, 1906, without a jury, Middlesex (to be heard 1st week Easter Sittings, by order) March 9

Weldon v Matthews appl of pliff from judgt of The Lord Chief Justice and Justices Ridley and Darling, dated Feb 26, 1906 March 9

Porch v Hawes appl of pliff from judgt of Mr Justice Darling, dated Feb 24, 1906, without a jury, Middlesex March 9

Barnett v Butler appl of pliff from judgt of The Lord Chief Justice and Justices Ridley and Darling, dated Feb 27, 1906 March 10

Baker v The Realm Assoc Id appeal of debts from judgt of Mr Justice Channell, dated Feb 26, 1906, without a jury, Monmouth March 13

Gillett v Barrasford appl of debt from judgt of The Lord Chief Justice and Justices Ridley and Darling, dated March 5, 1906 March 15

Galloway v Steinberger appl of debt from judgt of Mr Justice Farwell (additional judge), dated Feb 6, 1906, without a jury, Middlesex March 16

The Attorney-Gen v Glossop and ors (Revenue) appl of debts from judgt of Mr Justice Walton, dated Dec 21, 1905, and cross notice by the Attorney-General March 30

Insole & Son v Gueret appl of debt from judgt of Mr Justice Phillimore, dated March 5, 1906, without a jury, Middlesex March 20

London United Tramways (1901) ld v Assessment Committee of Brentford Union and Overseers of the Parish of Chiswick appl of respts from judgt of The Lord Chief Justice and Justices Ridley and Darling, dated March 7, 1906 March 20

Wallis & Stevens ld v Waugh and Freeman appl of debt Freeman from judgt of Mr Justice Kennedy, dated March 16, 1906, without a jury, Middlesex March 22

Whipple v Penpoll Tin Smelting Co ld appl of debts from judgt of The Hon Judge Taylor, KC, Liverpool Court of Passage, dated March 10, 1906 March 24

Dolg v Barnard appl of pliff from judgt of Mr Justice A. T. Lawrence, dated Jan 12, 1906 April 3

Swale v Ipswich Tannery Id appl of pliff from judgt of Mr Justice Kennedy, dated March 23, 1906, without a jury, Middlesex April 5

Smith and anr v Gobbels and ors (trading as Gobbels & Grandjean) appl of debts from judgt of Mr Justice Bigham, dated March 28, 1906, without a jury, Middlesex April 6

Herman Von Freeden v Hull and ors (G T Turner and ors, 3rd parties) appl of L Dens, a 3rd party, from judgt of Mr Justice Phillimore, dated March 12, 1906, without a jury, Middlesex April 6

Von Freeden v Hull and ors appl of debts from judgt of Mr Justice Phillimore, dated March 12, 1906, without a jury, Middlesex April 9

The Mayor, Alderman and Councillors of Westminster v The Gordon Hotels Id appl of appts from judgt of The Lord Chief Justice and Justices Darling and Bray, dated April 6, 1906 April 11

# FROM THE PROBATE, DIVORCE, AND ADMIRALTY DIVISION (ADMIRALTY).

FOR HEARING.

With Nautical Assessors.

(Final List.)

1905.

Oravia—1904—Folio 438 The Owners of the Steamship Nereus and the Owners of the Cargo now or lately therein v The Owners of the Steamship Oravia appl of debts from judgt of Mr Justice Barnes, dated Feb 1, 1905 Feb 24

Cambrian Monarch—1905—Folio 509 The Clyde Shipping Co ld and ors v the Owners of the Cambrian Monarch, her cargo and freight appl of pliffs from judgt of the President and Mr Justice Bargrave Deane, dated April 5, 1905 May 4

Chaucer—1905—Folio 213 The Owners of Steamship Highland Mary v The Owners of Steamship Chaucer (damage) appl of pliffs from judgt of Mr Justice Bargrave Deane, dated April 15, 1905 May 10

Alleghany—1905—Folio 124 The Owners of Steamship Stelling and freight v The Owners of Steamship Alleghany and freight (damage) appl of debts from judgt of The President, dated May 11, 1905 May 26

1906.

Vestal—1905—Folio 381 The General Steam Navigation Co ld and ors v The Owners of the Steamship or Vessel Vestal, and cross notice by debts, dated Feb 2, 1906, to vary judgt (damage) appl of pliffs from judgt of Mr Justice Bargrave Deane, dated Jan 23, 1906 Jan 30

Clare Cumming—1905—Folio 337 The Owners of the Steamship Chatham and ors v The Owners of Steamship Clare Cumming and her freight (damage) appl of debt from judgt of The President, dated Dec 9, 1905 Feb 2

Tactician—1905—Folio 427 Owners of SS Leander v Owners of SS Tactician (damage) appl of debt from judgt of Mr Justice Bargrave Deane, dated Jan 15, 1906 Feb 19

Petunia—1906—Folio 50 Owners of SS Domingo v Owners of SS Petunia (salvage) appl of pliffs from judgt of Mr Justice Bargrave Deane, dated Feb 28, 1906 March 6

Bremen—1905—Folio 453 Owners of SS Lucigen v Owners of SS Bremen (salvage) appl of pliffs from judgt of Mr Justice Bargrave Deane, dated Feb 28, 1906 March 7

Vestal—1905—Folio 381 The General Steam Navigation Co ld and ors v The Owners of the Steamship or Vessel Vestal (salvage) appl of debts from judgt of Mr Justice Bargrave Deane, dated Jan 23, 1906 March 16

Anselm—1905—Folio 457 The Owners of a portion of cargo lately laden on board the Steamship Cyril v The Owners of Steamship Anselm (damage) appl of pliffs from judgt of Mr Justice Bargrave Deane, dated March 28, 1906 April 9

## Without Nautical Assessors.

(Final List.)

Hopper No 66—1906—Folio 34 (1905—J—2,364 Liverpool) Sir John Jackson ld v The Owners of SS Blanche and ors appl of pliffs from judgt of Mr Justice Bargrave Deane, dated Dec 21, 1905 Jan 17

## FROM THE KING'S BENCH DIVISION.

(New Trial Paper.)

1905.

Ogden v The Gas Light and Coke Co appl of debts for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, dated March 17, 1905, at trial before Mr Justice Darling and a special jury, Middlesex (s o not before Jan 20, 1906 March 24

Smith v Same appl of debts for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, dated March 17, 1905, at trial before Mr Justice Darling and a special jury, Middlesex (consolidated actions) (s o not before Jan 20, 1906) March 24

Thomas v Bradbury, Agnew & Co ld appl of debts for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, dated July 6, 1905, at trial before Mr Justice Darling and a special jury, Middlesex July 13

Cory and anr v Plymouth Breweries ld appl of debts for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, dated June 30, 1905, at trial before Mr Justice Ridley and a special jury, Exeter Aug 9

Meyer v Schwabach appl of debt for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, dated Nov 13, 1905, at trial before Mr Justice Bigham without a jury, Middlesex Nov 24

Clarkson v Drucker and anr appl of debts for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, dated Nov 21, 1905, at trial before Mr Justice Wills and a special jury, Middlesex Nov 30

Hope v Rodgers & Co appl of debts for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, dated Dec 13, 1905, at trial before Mr Justice Darling and a special jury, W Ridding, Yorkshire Dec 27

Darlow v Kay appl of pliff for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, dated Dec 6, 1905, at trial before Mr Justice Darling with a jury, Leeds Dec 30

1906.

Hordern v Hutton, ld appl of pliff for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, dated Dec 15, 1905, at trial before Mr Justice Grantham and a special jury, London Jan 3

Bentley Bros v Metcalfe & Co appl of debts for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, dated Dec 14, 1905, at trial before Mr Justice Darling and a special jury, York Jan 4

Hilton, Gibbs, & Smith v Morten appl of debt for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, dated Dec 18, 1905, at trial before Mr Justice Grantham and a special jury, Middlesex Jan 6

Chanasse & Kerr v Clayton and anr appl of debts for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, dated Dec 21, 1905, at trial before Mr Justice Kennedy and a common jury, Birmingham Jan 15

Greenwood (an infant, &c) v The Oceanic Steam Navigation Co ld appl of pliff for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, dated Jan 4, 1906, at trial before The Hon Judge Taylor, KC, and a special jury, Court of Passage, Liverpool Jan 22

Kellett v Stockport Corpn appl of pliff for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, dated Jan 23, 1906, at trial before Mr Justice Walton and a special jury, Manchester Feb 1

Spearing v Wandsworth Borough News Co ld appl of debts for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, dated Jan 24, 1906, at trial before Mr Justice Darling and a special jury, Middlesex Feb 2

Watt v Watt appl of debt for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, dated Jan 16, 1906, at trial before Mr Justice Bigham and a special jury, Middlesex Feb 5

Starkey v James appl of debt for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, dated Jan 5, 1906, at trial before Mr Justice Darling and a special jury, Middlesex Feb 6

Norton v Bailly appl of debt for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, dated Jan 19, 1906, at trial before Mr Justice Bigham and a special jury, Middlesex Feb 7

Ryan v James appl of pliff in form pauperis (by order) for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, dated Feb 1, 1906, at trial before Mr Justice Darling and a common jury Feb 9

Tyler & Co ld v Cambrian Ry Co appl of debts for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, dated Feb 7, 1906, at trial before Mr Justice Bigham and a special jury Feb 14

S F Edge ld v A J Wilson & Co ld appl of pliffs for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, dated Feb 9, 1906, at trial before Mr Justice Ridley and a special jury, Middlesex Feb 17

Collins v Johnstone and ors appln of debts for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, dated Feb 13, 1906, at trial before Mr Justice Lawrence and a special jury, Middlesex Feb 19

Harrod v Bucknall Steamship Lines ld Warren v Same (consolidated Actions) appln of debts for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, dated Feb 14, 1906, at trial before Mr Justice Lawrence Feb 22

Alford v Thrupp appln of plttf for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, dated Feb 6, 1906, at trial before Mr Justice Darling and a special jury, Middlesex Feb 23

Murray v Bushell appln of plttf for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, dated Feb 16, 1906, at trial before Mr Justice A T Lawrence and a special jury, Middlesex March 7

Manning v London and North-Western Railway Co appln of plttf for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, dated Feb 5, 1906, at trial before Mr Justice Bray and a special jury, Manchester March 9

Bell v Skinner appln of plttf for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, dated Jan 19, 1906, at trial before Mr Justice Darling and a common jury, Middlesex March 16

Diamant v Bewick Moreing & Co appln of debts for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, dated March 8, 1906, at trial before Mr Justice Lawrence and a special jury, Middlesex March 17

Sewell v Nat Telephone Co ld appln of plttf for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, dated March 14, 1906, at trial before Mr Justice Ridley and a special jury, Middlesex March 21

Barclay v Anglo-French African Syndicate ld appln of debts for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, dated March 20, 1906, at trial before Mr Justice Bray and a common jury, Middlesex March 28

Crier and Wife v Hope and anr appln of plttfs for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, dated March 8, 1906, at trial before Mr Justice A T Lawrence and a special jury, Middlesex March 29

Holmes & Sons v Cowan appln of plttf for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, dated March 21, 1906, at trial before Mr Justice Kennedy and a special jury, Middlesex March 29

Frost v London Joint Stock Bank ld appln of debts for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, dated March 28, 1906, at trial before Mr Justice Lawrence and a special jury, Middlesex April 3

Baileys ld v Marler and anr appln of plttfs for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, dated March 26, 1906, at trial before Mr Justice Darling and a special jury, Middlesex April 3

Littlejohn v Littlejohn and ors appln of plttf for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, dated Dec 19, 1905, at trial before Mr Justice Grantham and a special jury, Middlesex (time to appeal extended and to be heard 1st week of Easter Sitting, by order of April 2) April 4

In the Matter of an Arbitration between John Idiens & Sons ld and Cornelius J. Bosman and John Ideans & Sons ld and Ellis, Kislingsbury & Co appln of debts for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, dated March 29, 1906, at trial before Mr Justice Grantham and a special jury, City of London April 5

E Underwood & Son ld v Walter and ors appln of plttfs for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, dated March 30, 1906, at trial before Mr Justice Darling and a special jury, Middlesex April 6

Jackson v Jones appln of plttf for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, dated March 8, 1906, at trial before Mr Justice Channell and a special jury, Shrewsbury April 6

Meuse Portland Cement Joint Stock Co v The Southend Stone and Paving Co appln of plttfs for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, dated March 21, 1906, at trial before Mr Justice Bucknill and a common jury, Middlesex April 9

Gale v Maunders appln of plttf for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, dated March 24, 1906, at trial before Mr Justice Ridley and a common jury, Middlesex April 10

Neale v Electric and Ordnance Accessories Co ld appln of plttf for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, dated March 22, 1906, at trial before Mr Justice Ridley and a special jury, Birmingham April 11

Trueman v Williams and ors appln of plttf for judgt or new trial on appl from verdict and judgt, dated March 22, 1906, at trial before Mr Justice A T Lawrence and a special jury, Cardiff April 12

## FROM THE KING'S BENCH DIVISION.

(Interlocutory List.)

1906.

The Harbour Syndicate, ld v Unwin appl of Plttfs from order of Mr Justice Sutton, dated Feb 26, 1906 (s.o. to be mentioned again) Feb 27

African Estates, &c. Co v Martin appl of Debt from order of Mr Justice Sutton, dated Feb 28, 1906 (s.o. not before April 25) March 15

Symonds v Duke of Norfolk appl of Plttf from order of Mr Justice Channell, dated March 26, 1906 (s.o. not before May 9) April 5

In the Matter of Thomas Blair and William Blair Girling, Solicitors of the Supreme Court, and In re The Solicitors Act, 1843 appl of Blair & Girling from order of Mr Justice Channell, dated April 3, 1906 April 6

Potter v Profits and Income Inace Co, ld (Absolute Life Asse Co, ld and G Rue Fraser, clmte) appl of plttf from order of Mr Justice Kennedy, dated March 29, 1906 April 10

Gavin v Jungmann appl of debt from order of Mr Justice Channell, dated April 9, 1906 April 11

In re The Workmen's Compensation Act, 1897.

FROM COUNTY COURTS.

1905.

Zachariah Griffiths v The Wymstey Colliery Co ld appl of applicant from

award of County Court (Denbighshire, Wrexham), dated Sept 13, 1905 (security ordered—s o till further order) Oct 3

Smith v Standard Steam Fishing Co ld appl of applicant from award of County Court (Lincolnshire, Grimsby), dated Oct 12, 1905 Oct 26

Davies v The Taff Vale Railway Co appl of respts from award of County Court (Glamorganshire, Cardiff), dated Oct 7, 1905 Oct 27

Evans v Thomas appl of applicant from award of County Court (Carmarthenshire, Llanelly), dated Oct 10, 1905 Oct 30

J & G Wells ld v Taylor appl of applicants from award of County Court (Derbyshire, Chesterfield), dated Oct 30, 1905 Nov 18

Annie Owens (widow) v Thomas & Co ld appl of respts from award of County Court (Carmarthenshire, Llanelly), dated Nov 7, 1905 Nov 28

Bates v The Weardale Steel and Coke Co ld appl of applicant from award of County Court (Durham, Walsingham), dated Nov 11, 1905 Nov 29

Beer v Homelight Oil Co ld appl of applicant from award of County Court (Kent, Rochester), dated Nov 14, 1905 Dec 4

Tullock v B Waygood & Co ld appl of respts from award of County Court ( ), dated Nov 24, 1905 Dec 7

Geary v Hudson appl of applicant from award of County Court (Middlesex, Brentford), dated Nov 24, 1905 Dec 12

Lowe, John Edward v M Myers & Sons appl of applicant from award of County Court (Warwickshire, Yorkshire), dated Nov 29, 1905 Dec 20

Crowther v H & J Gaunt appl of applicant from award of County Court (Yorkshire, Bradford), dated Dec 19, 1905 Jan 8

Cameron v Associated Portland Cement Manufacturers (1900) ld appl of respts from award of County Court (Kent, Gravesend), dated Jan 9, 1906 Jan 24

Bold v Crompton & Co (Croston) ld appl of respts from award of County Court (Lancashire, Chorley), dated Jan 17, 1906 Jan 30

A M Burdon v Gregson & Co appl of applicant from award of County Court (Middlesex, Bow), dated Jan 15, 1906 Feb 2

Kitchen v Whitehead appl of applicant from award of County Court (Lancashire, Liverpool), dated Jan. 15, 1906 Feb 3

Swallow v G Lamb & Son appl of applicant from award of County Court (Sunderland, Durham), dated Jan 17, 1906 Feb 5

Whitworth v Whitworth appl of applicant from award of County Court (Yorkshire, Leeds), dated Jan 31, 1906 Feb 20

Smith v Urmsom & Thompson ld appl of respt from award of County Court (Oldham) dated Feb 8, 1906 March 1

Spencer v Babbington Coal Co appl of applicant from award of County Court (Nottinghamshire, Nottingham), dated Feb 15, 1906 March 6

Brooks v Linly Colliery Co ld appl of applicant from award of County Court (Nottinghamshire, Nottingham), dated Feb 15, 1906 March 6

Parkes v Army and Navy Co-operative Soc ld appl of applicant from award of County Court (Middlesex, Westminster), dated Feb 26, 1906 March 17

Doswell v Cowell appl of respt from award of County Court (Middlesex, Clerkenwell), dated March 12, 1906 March 24

Bibley v Levett appl of applicant from award of County Court (Yorkshire, Kingston-upon-Hull), dated March 13, 1906 March 29

Sperring & Co v Davies appl of applicant from award of County Court (Hampshire, Portsmouth), dated March 15, 1906 March 31

Doswell v Cowell appl of applicant from award of County Court (Middlesex, Clerkenwell), dated March 12, 1906 April 2

Gear v Thomas & Evans appl of applicant from award of County Court (Glamorganshire, Pontypridd), dated March 14, 1906 April 3

Edwards v Dominion Line Royal Mail Steamers appl of applicant from award of County Court (Lancashire, Liverpool), dated April 2, 1906 April 11

Mills v Waddington appl of applicant from award of County Court (Middlesex, Bow), dated March 6, 1906 April 11

N.B.—The above List contains Chancery, Palatine, and King's Bench Final and Interlocutory Appeals, &c, set down to April 12, 1906

## Winding-up Notices.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, April 27.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

COMBINE BOOT TREE, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before May 15, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts, to Campbell, Wigan, solr for liquidator

CURRIE & BURNISTON, LIMITED (IN VOLUNTARY LIQUIDATION)—Creditors are required, on or before May 14, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to V Fowler and S Schofield, Princes at chambers, Halifax

DOWELL SYNDICATE, LIMITED (IN LIQUIDATION)—Creditors are required, on or before May 26, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Richard Charles McCrea Poulter, 48, Queen Victoria st. Samuelson, Queen Victoria st, solr for liquidator

GOODWIN & SON, LIMITED—Petn for winding up will be heard May 8. De Buristie, Ely pl, Holborn circs, solr for petners. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of May 7

EGYPTIAN GOLD AND GEM SYNDICATE, LIMITED—Petn for winding up, presented April 29, directed to be heard May 8. Wickes & Knight, Union of, Old Broad st, solrs for petners. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of May 7

G AND H SYNDICATE, LIMITED (IN LIQUIDATION)—Creditors are required, on or before May 26, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Lacey Downes, Ironmonger in

MORAY, GALLOWAY, & CO, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before May 19, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to H B Graves, May bldgs, North John st, Liverpool. Collins & Co, Liverpool, solrs for liquidator

ST HELENS AND PRESCOT REPORTER CO, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before May 21, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to William Senior Ellis, Bank chambers, Hardshaw st, St Helens. Mamey, St Helens, solr for liquidator

WOOLLEN TRADERS MERCANTILE ASSOCIATION, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before May 15, to send their names and addresses, and particulars of their debts or claims,

to William Ros Sharp, Adelphi Chambers, 39, Brown St., Manchester. Lord, Leeds, solicitor for liquidator

#### UNLIMITED IN CHANCERY.

PERPETUAL BENEFIT BUILDING SOCIETY—Creditors are required, on or before June 1, to send their names and addresses, and particulars of their debts or claims, to William Savage and John Stubbs, Central bldg., 41, North John St., Liverpool

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, May 1.

#### JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

CALLIDE COAL SYNDICATE, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before Aug 31, to send their names and addresses, and particulars of their debts or claims, to Archibald Gordon Elmslie, 2, Broad St., Plymouth

CASE TRADERS, LIMITED (Newport, Monmouth)—Peta for winding up, presented April 4, directed to be heard at the Town Hall, Newport, May 11. Lewis, Chancery Ln., for Everett, Pontypool, solicitor for petitioners. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of May 10

HUNTHY & SONS, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before May 29, to send their names and addresses, and particulars of their debts or claims, to Theodore David Neal, 110, Edmund St., Birmingham

LONDON AND MANCHESTER PRESS AGENCY, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before May 7, to send their names and addresses, and particulars of their debts or claims, to Ernest Layton, 31 and 33, Broad St., Av

SOUTHAMPTON BILLPOSTING CO., LIMITED (IN VOLUNTARY LIQUIDATION)—Creditors are required, on or before May 15, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Geo Gear, 70, Above bar, Southampton

SOUTH SHIELDS TRAMWAY AND CARRIAGE CO., LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before June 14, to send their names and addresses, and particulars of their debts or claims, to W Frederick Cox, Donington House, Norfolk St., Strand. Morse, Norfolk St., Strand, solicitor for liquidator

## The Property Mart.

### Result of Sales

Messrs. H. E. Foster & Cranfield were successful in disposing of the following Leasehold Properties at the Mart, Tokenhouse-yard, E.C., on Wednesday last, at the prices named:—Nos. 37 and 39, Fernies-road, Balham, leases 37 years unexpired, ground-rents 22 6s. each, sold £445; Nos. 48, 49, and 50, Charleville-road, West Kensington, leases 74 years unexpired, ground-rents £12 each, sold £1,210; No. 17, Healey-street, Kentish Town, lease 54 years unexpired, ground-rent £7, sold £385; Nos. 18, 20, 22, and 24, Metley-street, Kennington, leases 25 years unexpired, ground-rents 25 6s. each, sold £1,600

#### REVERSIONS AND LIFE POLICIES.

Messrs. H. E. Foster & Cranfield held their usual Fortnightly Sale (No 810) of the above-named interests, at the Mart, Tokenhouse-yard, E.C., on Thursday last, when the following Lots were sold at the prices named, the total amount realized being £15,365:—

ABSOLUTE REVERSIONS:	
To £775 11s. 8d. ....	Sold 530
To £2,515 8s. ....	655
To £2,594 ....	7,000
To £8,237 10s. ....	4,900
POLICIES OF ASSURANCE for £2,000 ....	1,600

## Creditors' Notices.

Under 22 & 23 Vict. cap. 35.

#### LAST DAY OF CLAIM.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, April 27.

ACKERS, HARRIOTT SUSAN, Moreton Hall, nr Congleton, Cheshire June 1 Slater & Co Manchester

## Bankruptcy Notices.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, April 27.

#### RECEIVING ORDERS.

AUSTIN, GEORGE WILLIAM, Highbury pl, Islington, Photographer High Court Pet April 23 Ord April 24  
BARBER, ERNEST WILLIAM, Gt Grimsby, Fish Merchant Gt Grimsby Pet April 25 Ord April 25  
BARLING, HENRY ALDRIDGE, High St, Hounslow, Grocer Brentford Pet April 21 Ord April 21  
BARRETT, JAMES, Drayton, Norfolk, Shoemaker Norwich Pet April 23 Ord April 23  
BOLAN, HENRY, Newcastle upon Tyne, Grocer Newcastle on Tyne Pet April 24 Ord April 24  
BOTTOMLEY, LEWIS, Halifax, Mill Operative Halifax Pet April 23 Ord April 23  
BRAVERY, WILLIAM, Brighton, Furniture Dealer Brighton Pet April 23 Ord April 23  
BRENNLEY, TOM STOTT, Holford, nr Huddersfield, Dyer Huddersfield Pet April 10 Ord April 23  
BROADLEY, CHARLES WILLIAM, Gt Grimsby, Painter Wakefield Pet April 23 Ord April 23  
BROWN, GEORGE OLIVER, East Fens, Somerset, Farmer Wells Pet April 25 Ord April 25  
BURNAN, HARRIS, Chesham, Manchester, Grocer Manchester Pet April 23 Ord April 23  
BOROUGH, GEORGE, Ferham rd, West Kensington, Theatrical Lessee High Court Pet April 3 Ord April 23  
CASTELL & SON, E. Rivington st, Shoreditch, Packing Case Makers High Court Pet March 31 Ord April 23  
CLARK, A VINER, Charville rd, West Kensington, Medical Practitioner High Court Pet April 2 Ord April 23  
CLAREY, JAMES, Bradford, Draper Bradford Pet April 24 Ord April 24  
CREWFOOD, B DOUGLAS, Clifton on Sea, Manufacturers' Agent Colchester Pet April 19 Ord April 21  
DAVIS, A, Nottingham pl, Commercial rd, Jeweller High Court Pet March 31 Ord April 24  
DAWSON, GEORGE, Darlington, Commission Agent Stockton on Tees Pet April 24 Ord April 24  
GERKE, FREDERICK SAMUEL, Paddock Wood, Kent, Carpenter Tunbridge Wells Pet April 25 Ord April 25  
HICKTON, ERNEST WILFRED, Hill Top, West Bromwich,

Staffs, Licensed Victualler West Bromwich Pet April 23 Ord April 23  
HOBBS, WILLIAM, West Bromwich, Butcher West Bromwich Pet April 24 Ord April 24  
HUMPHRIES, GEORGE, Liverpool, Licensed Victualler Liverpool Pet March 30 Ord April 25  
HUTTON, WILLIAM GEORGE FREDERICK, West Hartlepool, Ironmonger Sunderland Pet April 23 Ord April 23  
JARRITT, CHARLES HENRY, and MARIE JARRITT, Worthing, Drapers Brighton Pet April 11 Ord April 23  
JAMES, HENRY, Gt Yarmouth, Co Merchant Gt Yarmouth Pet April 24 Ord April 24  
JONES, ERNEST ENOCH, Blakenhall, Wolverhampton, Grocer Wolverhampton Pet April 25 Ord April 25  
JONES, HUGH, Everton, Liverpool, Builder Liverpool Pet April 24 Ord April 24  
JONES, ROBERT, Gainsborough, Lincs, Butcher Lincoln Pet April 24 Ord April 24  
KIMBER, CYRUS, East Stour, Gillingham, Dorset, Printer Salisbury Pet April 24 Ord April 24  
KIRK, JAMES HERBERT, Macclesfield, Cattle Dealer Macclesfield Pet April 11 Ord April 23  
KOENIGSBERG, LOUIS ALBERT, Goddard st, St Paul's churchyard, Furrer High Court Pet April 25 Ord April 25  
LEE, JAMES, Bexley, Kent, Market Gardener Rochester Pet April 23 Ord April 23  
LEGG, ALBERT EDWIN, Bilson, Staffs, Baker Wolverhampton Pet April 23 Ord April 23  
MARSH, WILLIAM, Orsett mews, Gloucester ter, Hyde Park, Johanna High Court Pet April 23 Ord April 23  
MARRIOTT, DAVID THOMAS, Gt Grimsby, Labourer Gt Grimsby Pet April 24 Ord April 24  
MASTER, HENRY HUGH, South Melbourne, Victoria, Australia, Surgeon High Court Pet Dec 23 Ord April 25  
MITCHELL, FREDERICK GEORGE, Sheffield, Fish Dealer Sheffield Pet April 23 Ord April 23  
NEWCOMB, FRED, Gt Grimsby, Hairdresser Gt Grimsby Pet April 23 Ord April 23  
NEWTON, JOHN WINNER, Bromley Common, Kent, Licensed Victualler Chelmsford Pet April 24 Ord April 24  
OWEN, THOMAS, Pentrebach, Merthyr Tydfil, Collier Merthyr Tydfil Pet April 24 Ord April 24  
PARK, ALFRED HENRY, King's Lynn, Norfolk, Printer King's Lynn Pet April 23 Ord April 23

PARKER, JOHN, Cardiff, Fruit Merchant Cardiff Pet April 23 Ord April 23  
PIKE, CHARLES FREDERICK, Manchester, Calico Printer Manchester Pet April 10 Ord April 23  
SHAWCROSS, WILLIAM, and WILLIAM ORR, Ashton in Makerfield, Painters Wigan Pet April 24 Ord April 24  
SOLOMONS, ABRAHAM, Reading, Traveller Reading Pet April 24 Ord April 24  
STORES, JOHN, Nottingham, Coal Merchant Kingston upon Hull Pet April 10 Ord April 24  
THOMAS, EVAN LEWIS, Aberhargoed, Mon, Grocer Trefegaf Pet April 24 Ord April 24  
THOMAS, THOMAS EVAN, Maesteg, Glam, Builder Cardiff Pet April 23 Ord April 23  
WALSH, HENRY JAMES DIBBT, Brighton High Court Pet March 10 Ord March 29  
WHITE, ARTHUR, Leicester, Smallware Dealer Leicester Pet April 23 Ord April 23  
YOUNG, JOHN, Park st, Chiswick, Builder Brentford Pet March 12 Ord April 24

#### FIRST MEETINGS.

ARCHER, ALBERT, Walkley, Sheffield, Engineer's Fitter May 7 at 11 Off Rec, Fytrope la, Sheffield  
BARRETT, JAMES, Drayton, Norfolk, Shoemaker May 7 at 12.30 Off Rec, 8, King st, Norwich  
BATES, TATNAI, and JARVIS STEAKMAN, Droydsden, Lanes, Builders May 9 at 3 Off Rec, Byrom st, Manchester  
BENNETT, SETH THOMAS, Salisbury, Motor Agent May 8 at 2.30 Off Rec, City Chambers, Catherine st, Salisbury  
BOTTOMLEY, LEWIS, Halifax, Mill Operative May 14 at 12 Off Rec, Townhall Chambers, Halifax  
BOYD, ROBERT, Llandudno, Electrician May 7 at 12 Crypt Chambers, Eastgate row, Chester  
BRAVERY, WILLIAM, Brighton, Furniture Dealer May 8 at 11 Off Rec, 4, Pavilion bldg, Brighton  
BURNAN, HARRIS, Chesham, Manchester, Grocer May 5 at 11 Off Rec, Byrom st, Manchester  
BURROUGHS, GEORGE, Ferham rd, West Kensington, Theatrical Lessee May 10 at 12 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey st  
CASTELL & SON, E. Rivington st, Packing Case Makers May 10 at 11 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey st  
CLARK, A VINER, Charville rd, West Kensington, Medical Practitioner May 11 at 11 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey st  
CLAREY, JAMES, Bradford, Draper May 8 at 8 Off Rec, 25, Tyndal st, Bradford

ADEINS, WILLIAM, Rochester, Builder May 31 Rye & Rye, Golden sq  
BARNISTER, THOMAS, Leominster May 26 Easton, Leominster  
BEARD, HARRIETT ANN, High Ln, nr Stockport May 28 Marriott, Manchester  
BIDWELL, LAURA JONES, Richmond May 31 Umney, Richmond; Davies & Co, Chesterfield  
BLAKET, WALTER MATTHEW, Malton, Yorks, Innkeeper May 31 Ridge, Malton, Yorks  
BROOKER, ELIZABETH, High Ercall, nr Wellington, Salop June 4 Travis & Sheldon, Shrewsbury  
BROWN, ALFRED FOUNTAIN, Oxtow, Chester, Linen Merchant May 18 Laces & Co, Liverpool  
BULGIN, GEORGE JOHN, Brixham, Devon, Bank Manager May 19 Parsons, Brixham  
CORNER, HADEN, Ingatstone, Essex May 24 Miller & Smiths, Salter's Hall ct, Cannon st, Cox, ANN CLEMENTS ALEXANDER, Orchard St Mary, Wilts June 1 Wilson & Sons, Salisbury  
CROSBY, WILLIAM, Tavito st, Gordon sq May 30 Hind & Robinson, Stone bldg, Lincoln's inn  
CURRY, ELIZABETH, Broadstairs June 1 O A & K Daniel, Ramsgate  
DEAR, LYDIA, Huntingdon May 25 Maule & Sons, Huntingdon  
DENNIS, EDWARD, Barnstable May 11 Finch & Chanter, Barnstable  
EASTON, JANE, Earlsfield rd, Wandsworth May 25 Correll & Berney, East hill, Wandsworth  
EDGAR, SARAH ELIZABETH, Buxton May 21 Shipton, Buxton  
GARRETT, CLARKSON, Crouch hill, Horsey June 1 Waddy & Kelsey, Finsbury prmt  
GARLAND, RICHARD WILKIN, Mill Ln, West Hamstead, June 16 Turner & Co, Nottingham  
GREEN, MARY ANN, Redhill, Builder May 31 King & Co, Queen Victoria st  
HAWORTH, HENRY, Blackley, Manchester, Corn Merchant May 25 Sampson & Price, Manchester  
HETES, HANNAH, Hove, Sussex June 9 Oldam, Liverpool  
HOLYOAKE, GEORGE JACOB, Brighton, Journalist May 25 Emmet & Co, Bloomsbury sq  
HOBSON, AGNES SARAH, Shrewsbury May 16 Newell, Wellington, Salop  
IBBOTT, JAMES, Isle of Ely, Cambridge May 30 Hall, Ely  
KNIGHT, THOMAS SIMPSON, Brondesbury Park, Hot Water Engineer May 31 Lithgow, Wimpole st  
LOW, WILLIAM MACKAY, Wellesbourne, Warwick June 1 Gasquet & Co, Mincing In  
LYTHGOE, JOHN, Crewe May 11 Pedley, Crewe  
MARSHALL, THOMAS PATTERSON, jun, Wylam, Northumberland May 15 Kitching, jun, West Hartlepool  
PAINTER, HANNAH, Nottingham May 11 Marriott, Nottingham  
PERKS, JOHN, Birmingham, Beer Retailer May 26 Harding & Son, Birmingham  
PERRING, FRANCES MARY, Withycombe Raleigh, Devon May 25 Day & Son, Exeter  
PHILLIPS, MARY JANE, Boston, Lincs May 13 White & Son, Grantham  
PLACKETT, SARAH, Buxton, Derby May 25 Wilson, Long Eaton, nr Nottingham  
PLOT, ESTHER, Chelmsford June 11 Sloper & Co, Putney  
RANDLES, ANNE, Allington, nr Wrexham May 26 Bury & Acton, Wrexham  
ROBES, WILLIAM HENRY, Aberavenny, Mon June 30 Bythway & Son, Pontypool  
SEATON, MARY, Chorlton on Medlock, Manchester June 4 Farrar & Co, Manchester  
SENIOR, JOSEPH JULIAN EMANUEL, Hill st, Berkeley sq June 6 Lattey & Hart, Cardoile st  
SINGTON, HENRY FRANCIS, Malvern, Victoria June 4 St Barbe & Co, Delabury st, Westminster  
SKINNER, MARTHA, Sidmouth, Devon June 16 Rooke & Sons, Lincoln's inn fields  
SMITH, KENNETH, Summerfield Park, Birmingham June 15 Shephards & Walters, Finsbury circus  
STORES, ELIZABETH, Borough Green, Kent May 31 Fullagar & Co, Bolton  
SWANSON, MARY JANE, Heaton Norris, Lanes May 25 Grundey, Stockport  
TURNER, OSWALD, Heaton Chapel, Heaton Norris, Lanes May 25 Grundey, Stockport  
VICKERS, RICHARD, Tipton, nr Bolton, Stock Broker June 15 Dowling & Co, Bolton  
WAGSTAFF, JAMES, Birmingham June 1 Rieby & Son, Birmingham  
WARD, JOHN, Ladbroke grove, Notting Hill May 31 Munns & Longdon, Old Jewry  
WATSON, WILLIAM CLARENCE, Sharnbrook, Beds, JP, DL June 30 Austin & Austin, Clement's inn, Strand  
WEBB, EDWARD, Harlow, Essex June 6 Webb, Theobald's rd, Bedford row  
WHITAKER, CHARLES JAMES, Teddington, Solicitor May 30 Whitaker, Gospel Oak  
WHITTON, THOMAS SMANT, Cephas st, St Peter's rd, Mile End June 1 Ashbridge, Fenchurch st  
WILSON, JOSEPH, Halifax June 4 Longbottom & Sons, Halifax  
WINGOT, ROSE ANN, Clapton June 1 Evans & Co, Theobald's rd, Bedford row  
WOOD, FRANK STANLEY, Moorhead Bishop, Devon June 2 Bedell, Manchester  
WOOD, JAMES, Westow st, Upper Norwood May 19 Snow & Co, Queen st, Cannon st

COLLA, RICHARD, Weedington rd, Kentish Town, Fruit  
Salesman May 5 at 1 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey at  
Duke, FRANK ALBERT, Leadenham, Lincs, Blacksmith  
May 5 at 12 Off Rec, 31, Silvert st, Lincoln  
EDWARDS, EVAN, Cospudenman, Pontypriid, Draper May  
7 at 3 135, High st, Merthyr Tydfil  
FOSTER, SARAH ANN, Darlaston, Staffs, General Dealer  
May 9 at 11.30 Off Rec, Wolverhampton  
FOUNTAIN, JOHN GEORGE, Beeston, Notts May 8 at 11  
Off Rec, 4, Castle pl, Park st, Nottingham  
GREEN, FREDERICK SAMUEL, Faddock Wood, Kent, Car-  
penter May 7 at 11.15 C 8 Farris, 67, High st, Tun-  
bridge Wells  
HAINES, NERHEIM WILLIAM, Swindon, Plumber May 7  
at 11 Off Rec, 38, Regent circus, Swindon  
HARGREAVES, SAMUEL, Buxton, Electrical Engineer May 8  
at 11 Off Rec, Castle chmbrs, 6, Vernon st, Stockport  
JACOBS, JOHN, Kinkate Market, Leeds, Potato Salesman  
May 8 at 3 Off Rec, 22, Park row, Leeds  
KEELING, THOMAS COWAN, Walthamstow, Milk Contractor  
May 9 at 11 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey at  
KIMBER, CYRUS, Gillingham, Dorset, Printer May 8 at 2.15  
Off Rec, City chmbrs, Catherine st, Salisbury  
KNIGHT, JOHN, Beeston, Notts, Builder May 8 at 12 Off  
Rec, 4, Castle pl, Park st, Nottingham  
KONIGSBERG, LOUIS ALBERT, Godliman st, St Paul's  
churchyard, Furrer May 8 at 2.30 Bankruptcy  
bldg, Carey at  
LEE, JAMES, Bexley, Kent, Market Gardener May 7 at  
11.50 115, High st, Rochester  
LEGG, CHARLES, Dorchester, Dairyman May 8 at 2 Off  
Rec, City chmbrs, Catherine st, Salisbury  
LEHMANN, AUGUST JULIUS ALBERT, Dextington pk rd,  
West Hampstead, Commercial Traveller May 9 at 12  
Bankruptcy bldg, Carey at  
METCALFE, ARTHUR, Walsall, Tobacconist May 9 at 11 Off  
Rec, Wolverhampton  
NEWBURY, JOHN, Rotherham, Yorks, Boot Dealer May 7 at  
12.30 Off Rec, Figgree in, Sheffield  
PARRY, EVAN DANIEL, Treherbert, Blaencwm, Glam, Grocer  
May 8 at 12 135, High st, Merthyr Tydfil  
PRICE, WILLIAM, HENRY, Faddock Wood, Kent, Dentist  
May 7 at 11 C J Farris, 67, High st, Tunbridge Wells  
RATCLIFFE, JAMES HENRY, Hough Green, nr Widnes, Brush  
Manufacturer May 7 at 10.30 Off Rec, 33, Victoria st,  
Liverpool  
SUCKLING, ALFRED, Halstead, Essex, Builder May 7 at 11  
Great Eastern Hotel, Liverpool st  
TURNER, EDWIN ALEXANDER, FORT Hill, Patentee May 8  
at 11.30 132, York rd, Westminster Bridge rd  
TYSON, ISAAC, Calderbridge, Cumberland, Builder May 8  
at 11.15 County Court House, Whitehaven  
VEAL, HENRY, Doleton, North Tumerston, Cornwall, Farmer  
May 10 at 3 94, High st, Barnastaple  
WALKER, EUNICE, Blackpool May 8 at 12 Off Rec, 35,  
Victoria st, Liverpool  
WHITEHOUSE, WILLIAM, Kate's Hill, Dudley, Worcester  
May 7 at 11 Off Rec, 199, Wolverhampton st, Dudley

## ADJUDICATIONS.

AUSTEN, GEORGE WILLIAM, Highbury pl, Islington, Photo-  
grapher High Court Pet April 23 Ord April 23  
BARBER, ERNEST WILLIAM, Gt Grimsby, Fish Merchant  
Gt Grimsby Pet April 25 Ord April 25  
BARLING, HENRY ALDRIDGE, High st, Hounslow, Grocer  
Brentford Pet April 21 Ord April 21  
BARRITT, JAMES, Drayton, Norfolk, Shoemaker Norwich  
Pet April 25 Ord April 25  
BOLAN, HENRY, Newcastle on Tyne, Grocer Newcastle on  
Tyne Pet April 25 Ord April 25  
BOTTOMLEY, LEWIS, Halifax, Mill Operative Halifax  
Pet April 23 Ord April 23  
BRAVETT, WILLIAM, Brighton, Furniture Dealer Brighton  
Pet April 23 Ord April 23  
BROADLEY, CHARLES WILLIAM, Goole, Yorks, Painter  
Wakefield Pet April 23 Ord April 23  
BROWN, GEORGE OLIVER, East Pennard, Somerset, Farmer  
Wells Pet April 25 Ord April 25  
BURNHAM, HARRIS, Cheetham, Manchester, Grocer Man-  
chester Pet April 23 Ord April 23  
CLEASBY, JAMES, Bradford, Draper Bradford Pet April 24  
Ord April 24  
COHEN, JOSEPH PHILIP, Fenchurch st High Court Pet  
Jan 30 Ord April 24  
CROSLAND, THOMAS WILLIAM HODGSON, Gettard st, Soho  
High Court Pet Jan 18 Ord April 24  
DAWSON, GEORGE, Houndgate, Darlington, Commission  
Agent Stockton on Tees Pet April 24 Ord April 24  
GREEN, FREDERICK SAMUEL, Faddock Wood, Carpenter  
Tunbridge Wells Pet April 25 Ord April 25  
HARGREAVES, SAMUEL, Buxton, Derby, Electrical Engineer  
Stockport Pet April 20 Ord April 20  
HICKORY, ERNEST WILFRED, Hill Top, West Bromwich,  
Staffs, Licensed Victualler West Bromwich Pet  
April 25 Ord April 25  
HOLDEN, WILLIAM, West Bromwich, Staffs, Butcher West  
Bromwich Pet April 24 Ord April 24  
HUTTON, WILLIAM GEORGE FREDERICK, West Hartlepool,  
Ironmonger Sunderland Pet April 23 Ord April 24  
JARBETT, CHARLES HENRY, and MARIE JARBETT, Worthing,  
Drapers Brighton Pet April 11 Ord April 24  
JAMES, HENRY, East Street, Coal Merchant Gt  
Yarmouth Pet April 24 Ord April 24  
JONES, ERNEST Enoch, Blakenhall, Wolverhampton, Grocer  
Wolverhampton Pet April 25 Ord April 25  
JONES, HUGH, Everton, Liverpool, Builder Liverpool Pet  
April 24 Ord April 24  
JONES, ROBERT, Gainsborough, Linc, Butcher Lincoln  
Pet April 24 Ord April 24  
KIMBER, CYRUS, Gillingham, Printer Salisbury  
Pet April 24 Ord April 24  
KIRK, JAMES HERBERT, Macclesfield, Cattle Dealer Maccles-  
field Pet April 11 Ord April 24  
KONIGSBERG, LOUIS ALBERT, Godliman st, St Paul's  
churchyard, Furrer High Court Pet April 25 Ord  
April 25  
LEE, JAMES, Bexley, Kent, Market Gardener Rochester  
Pet April 25 Ord April 25  
LEGG, ALBERT ROWLEY, Biston, Staffs, Baker Wolver-  
hampton Pet April 25 Ord April 24

MANSSELL, WILLIAM, Orsett mews, Gloucester ter, Hyde  
Park, Jobmaster High Court Pet April 25 Ord  
April 25  
MARRIOTT, DAVID THOMAS, Gt Grimsby, Labourer Gt  
Grimsby Pet April 24 Ord April 24  
MITCHELL, FREDERICK GEORGE, Sheffield, Poultry Dealer  
Sheffield Pet April 25 Ord April 25  
NEWSOME, FRED, Gt Grimsby, Hairdresser Gt Grimsby  
Pet April 25 Ord April 25  
NEWTON, JOHN WINZER, Bromley Common, Kent, Licensed  
Victualler Chelmsford Pet April 24 Ord April 24  
OWEN, THOMAS, Pentrebach, Merthyr Tydfil, Collier  
Merthyr Tydfil Pet April 24 Ord April 24  
PARK, ALFRED HENRY, King's Lynn, Norfolk, Printer  
King's Lynn Pet April 23 Ord April 23  
PARKER, JOHN, Cardiff, Fruit Merchant Cardiff Pet April  
25 Ord April 25  
PARRY, EVAN DANIEL, Blaencwm, Glam, Grocer Ponty-  
pridd Pet April 6 Ord April 25  
PRICE, WILLIAM HENRY, Faddock Wood, Kent, Dentist  
Tunbridge Wells Pet April 20 Ord April 24  
SCRIVEN, HUBERT, Studley, Warwick, Butcher Warwick  
Pet Feb 3 Ord April 20  
SHAWCROSS, WILLIAM, and WILLIAM ORR, Ashton in Maker-  
field, Lancs, Painters Wigan Pet April 24 Ord  
April 24  
STORER, JOHN, Cottingham, Yorks, Coal Merchant King-  
ston upon Hull Pet April 19 Ord April 25  
SUZEMAN, ARTHUR HAROUTYER, Manchester, Merchant  
Manchester Pet March 19 Ord April 23  
THOMAS, EVAN LEWIS, Abergeog, Mon, Grocer Tredegar  
Pet April 24 Ord April 24  
THOMAS, THOMAS EVAN, Maesteg, Glam, Builder Cardiff  
Pet April 25 Ord April 25  
WALKER, EUNICE, Blackpool Liverpool Pet March 20  
Ord April 23  
WHITE, ARTHUR, Leicester, Smallware Dealer Leicester  
Pet April 23 Ord April 23  
WILEMAN, WILLIAM, Measham, Leicester, Furniture Dealer  
Burton on Trent Pet March 22 Ord April 25  
Amended notice substituted for that published in the  
London Gazette of Dec 12:  
COOK, ALBERT JENNER, King's Heath, Worcester, Manu-  
facturer Birmingham Pet Aug 11 Ord Dec 7  
Amended notice substituted for that published in the  
London Gazette of March 23:  
SINLEY, GEORGE OLMES, Saltburn by the Sea, Yorks,  
Tobacconist Middlebrough Pet March 21 Ord  
March 21  
Amended notice substituted for that published in the  
London Gazette of April 13:  
PHILIPSON, WILLIAM THOMAS, Cleethorpes, Ironmonger Gt  
Grimsby Pet April 7 Ord April 7  
London Gazette.—TUESDAY, May 1.

## RECEIVING ORDERS.

BARTLETT, ALBERT HENRY, Bridgefoot, Emsworth, Hants  
Portsmouth Pet April 4 Ord April 27  
BECKETT, HENRY, Beverley, Yorks, Bricklayer Kingston  
upon Hull Pet April 25 Ord April 26  
BUCKLEY, WALTER, Delph, Yorks, Grocer Oldham Pet  
April 25 Ord April 26  
BURNLEY, ARTHUR HARRISON, York York Pet April 26  
Ord April 26  
BUSH, JOSEPH, St George, Bristol, Greengrocery Hawker  
Bristol Pet April 27 Ord April 27  
FENNEY, THOMAS FRANCIS, Middleton one Row, Durham,  
Builder Stockton on Tees Pet April 26 Ord April 26  
GLEDEHILL, FREDERICK, Bradford Bradford Pet April 27  
Ord April 27  
GORDON, ROBERT CHARLES, Stockton on Tees, Cartwright  
Stockton on Tees Pet April 26 Ord April 26  
HARDIE, JAMES, Headingley, Commission Agent Leeds  
Pet April 26 Ord April 26  
HARDING, WILLIAM GEORGE, Exeter, Baker Exeter Pet  
April 26 Ord April 26  
HAYHOW, RICHARD JAMES, Kempford gdns, Brompton  
High Court Pet April 2 Ord April 27  
HENCHLEY, ROBERT, St Bride's ln, Publican High Court  
Pet March 14 Ord April 27  
HIRD, REUBEN, Gloucester, Chemist Gloucester Pet April  
3 Ord April 26  
KITCHEN, JAMES, Fulwood, nr Preston, Tailor Preston  
Pet April 19 Ord April 25  
LEES, WILLIAM HENRY, Prestwich, Lancs, Estate Agent  
Manchester Pet April 26 Ord April 26  
LEVI, ABRAHAM, Gt Prescott st, Whitechapel, Tailor High  
Court Pet April 25 Ord April 25  
LONG, HERBERT W, Staple Hill, Glos, Grocer Bristol Pet  
April 26 Ord April 27  
MCCANN, JAMES, Jarrow, Durham, Grocer Newcastle on  
Tyne Pet April 26 Ord April 26  
MARSHALL, HARRY LEVETT, Hove, Sussex, Clerk Brighton  
Pet March 23 Ord April 30  
MUSGOVE, GEORGE, Hargratt, Piano Dealer York Pet  
April 25 Ord April 25  
PARSON, WALTER EDWIN, Stechford, Worcester, Fish  
Dealer Birmingham Pet April 24 Ord April 24  
PARKER, RICHARD JOHN, Seven Sisters rd, Tottenham,  
Contractor Edmonton Pet Dec 13 Ord April 23  
PINNOR, SAMUEL, Wotton under Edge, Glos, Plumber  
Gloucester Pet April 26 Ord April 26  
PRENCE, WILLIAM, sen, Ledbury, Hereford, House  
Decorator Worcester Pet April 27 Ord April 27  
SHEPHERD, SAMUEL, 28, Helens, Lancs, Butcher Liverpool  
Pet April 25 Ord April 25  
SPARROW, ARTHUR JAMES, Bayleigh, Lancs, Butcher  
Chelmsford Pet April 27 Ord April 27  
STEVENS, TOM WILLIAM, Brampton, Derby, Tailor Chester-  
field Pet April 26 Ord April 26  
STEVENSON, FRANCIS SEYMOUR, Ennismore gdns, Knights-  
bridge High Court Pet April 4 Ord April 26  
STOCK, CLIFFORD FRANCIS, Weston super Mare, Coal  
Merchant May 9 at 11.45 Off Rec, 28, Baldwin st,  
Bristol  
THOMAS, WILLIAM, Brittonferry, Glam, General Dealer  
Neath Pet April 25 Ord April 26

THORNEY, JOHN, Skelton in Cleveland, Yorks, Surgeon  
Stockton on Tees Pet April 23 Ord April 27  
TUBS, ARTHUR WALTER, Downley, West Wycombe, Bucks,  
Baker Aylesbury Pet April 26 Ord April 26  
TWELVETREES, HENRY JAMES, and ROBERT ALFRED  
TWELVETREES, Biggleswade, Bakers Bedford Pe  
April 26 Ord April 26  
WARWICK, EDWARD, Birchfield, Handsworth, Tube Manu-  
facturer's Foreman Birmingham Pet April 24 Ord  
April 24  
WATERS, FREDERICK GEORGE, Leeds, Electrician Leeds  
Pet April 23 Ord April 23  
WATKINS, HERBERT, Bargoed, Glam, Outfitter Merthyr  
Tydfil Pet April 9 Ord April 27  
WESLEY, JAMES, Ipswich, Butcher Ipswich Pet April 3  
Ord April 24  
WHEELER, THOMAS PARRY, Goswell rd, Commission Agent  
High Court Pet April 4 Ord April 26

RECEIVING ORDER RESCINDED AND  
PETITION DISMISSED.

RISDALE, JOHN WILLIAM, Cornhill, Insurance Broker  
High Court Pet Feb 8 Rec Ord March 7 Rec and  
Dis April 25

## FIRST MEETINGS.

ABOCH, GEORGE EDWARD, St Albans, Herts, Builder May  
9 at 12 Peashon Hotel, St Albans  
AUSTEN, GEORGE WILLIAM, Highbury pl, Islington, Photo-  
grapher May 11 at 12 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey at  
BRIDLEY, GEORGE, Northallerton, Yorks, Carter May 11  
at 11.30 Courthouse, Northallerton  
BOLAN, HENRY, Newcastle on Tyne, Grocer May 9 at 11  
Off Rec, 30, Mooley st, Newcastle on Tyne  
BRIERLEY, TOM STOTT, Holmfirth, nr Huddersfield, Dyer  
May 10 at 3 Off Rec, Prudential bldg, New st,  
Huddersfield  
BRIDLEY, CHARLES WILLIAM, Goole, Yorks, Painter May  
9 at 11 Off Rec, 6, Bond ter, Wakefield  
BROOKS, ERNEST WILFRED, Harrow, Grocer May 10 at 12  
14, Bedford row  
BROWN, GEORGE OLIVER, East Pennard, Somerset, Farmer  
May 9 at 11.30 Off Rec, 25, Baldwin st, Bristol  
BURNLEY, ARTHUR HARRISON, York May 10 at 3 Off Rec,  
The Red House, Duncombe pl, York  
BUSH, JOSEPH, Bristol, Greengrocery Hawker May 9 at  
12.15 Off Rec, 26, Baldwin st, Bristol  
CLACT, GEORGE, Reading, Carpenter May 10 at 12 Queen's  
Hotel, Reading  
CLARK, WILLIAM, jun, Birmingham, Fruiterer May 9 at 11  
191, Corporation st, Birmingham  
DAVIES, A, Nottingham pl, Commercial rd, Jeweller May  
11 at 1 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey at  
DOWN, ERNEST ROBERT ADAMS, Plymouth, Dentist's Assis-  
tant May 16 at 11 Off Rec, 6, Athenium ter, Plymouth  
DUGGAN, RICHARD LONGWORTH, Plymouth, Commission  
Agent May 11 at 11 Off Rec, 6, Athenium ter,  
Plymouth  
EYRE, ARTHUR NEVILLE, Preston Park, Brighton May 17  
at 2.30 Off Rec, 4, Pavilion bldg, Brighton  
GLEDEHILL, FREDERICK, Bradford May 11 at 3 Off Rec,  
29, Tyrel st, Bradford  
HADDOCK, HARRY, Shifnal, Salop, Butcher May 9 at 12  
Off Rec, 22, Swan hill, Shifnal  
HARDIE, JAMES, Headingley, Commission Agent May 10  
at 11 Off Rec, 22, Park row, Leeds  
HARDING, WILLIAM GEORGE, Exeter, Baker May 17 at 10.30  
Off Rec, 9, Bedford circus, Exeter  
HAYHOW, RICHARD JAMES, Kempford gdns, Brompton  
May 14 at 11 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey at  
HENCHLEY, ROBERT, St Bride's ln, Publican May 15 at 11  
Bankruptcy bldg, Carey at  
JARBETT, CHARLES HENRY, and MARIE JARBETT, Spinkier,  
Worthing, Drapers May 9 at 12 Off Rec, 4, Pavilion  
bldg, Brighton  
LONG, HERBERT W, Staple Hill, Glos, Grocer May 9 at 12  
Off Rec, 26, Baldwin st, Bristol  
MCCANN, JAMES, Jarrow, Durham, Grocer May 9 at 11.30  
Off Rec, 30, Mooley st, Newcastle on Tyne  
MANSSELL, WILLIAM, Orsett mews, Gloucester ter, Hyde  
Park, Jobmaster May 9 at 2.30 Bankruptcy bldg,  
Carey at  
MASTER, HENRY HUGH, South Melbourne, Victoria, Aus-  
tralia, Surgeon May 11 at 2.30 Bankruptcy bldg,  
Carey at  
MITCHELL, FREDERICK GEORGE, Sheffield, Fish Dealer  
May 9 at 12 Off Rec, Figgree in, Sheffield  
MUSGOVE, GEORGE, Hargratt, Piano Dealer May 11 at  
11.30 Off Rec, The Red House, Duncombe pl, York  
OWEN, THOMAS, Pentrebach, Merthyr Tydfil, Glam, Collier  
May 9 at 12 135, High st, Merthyr Tydfil  
SHAWCROSS, WILLIAM, and WILLIAM ORR, Ashton in Maker-  
field, Lancs, Painters May 9 at 3 19, Exchange st,  
Bolton  
SHELSON, JAMES, Sutton in Ashfield, Notts, Corn Dealer  
May 9 at 11.30 Off Rec, 4, Castle pl, Park st, Notting-  
ham  
SOLOMONS, ABRAHAM, Reading, Traveller May 10 at 12.30  
Queen's Hotel, Reading  
STEVENSON, FRANCIS SEYMOUR, Ennismore gardens, Knights-  
bridge May 10 at 11 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey at  
STOCK, CLIFFORD FRANCIS, Weston super Mare, Coal  
Merchant May 9 at 11.45 Off Rec, 28, Baldwin st,  
Bristol  
STRANWOOD, WILLIAM, Huntingdon, Coach Builder May  
9 at 2.30 George Hotel, Huntingdon  
THOMAS, THOMAS EVAN, Abergeog, Mon, Grocer May  
10 at 12 135, High st, Merthyr Tydfil  
WAKELING, WILLIAM, Brentwood, Master Bricklayers May  
9 at 3 14, Bedford row  
WALSH, HENRY JAMES DIGNY, Brighton May 9 at 12 Bank-  
ruptcy bldg, Carey at  
WATERS, FREDERICK GEORGE, Leeds, Electrician May 10 at  
11.30 Off Rec, 22, Park row, Leeds  
WESTWOOD, ROBERT, Birmingham, Grocer May 9 at 12  
191, Corporation st, Birmingham  
WHEELER, THOMAS PARRY, Goswell rd, Commission  
Agent May 10 at 12 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey at  
WHITE, ARTHUR, Leicester, Smallware Dealer May 9 at 12  
Off Rec, 1, Berridge st, Leicester

WYSE, THOMAS PRATMAN, Whitechurch, Salop, Licensed  
Victualler May 9 at 11.30 Off Rec, King st, Newcastle,  
Staffs

Amended notice substituted for that published in the  
London Gazette of April 24:

NORMAN, SARAH LYDIA, Horley, Surrey, Milliner May 3 at  
11.30 182, York rd, Westminster Bridge

#### ADJUDICATIONS.

BRACKET, HENRY, Beverley, Yorks, Bricklayer Kingston  
upon Hull Pet April 26 Ord April 28

BOARDMAN, JAMES, Werneth, Cheshire, Chartered Account-  
ant Manchester Ord April 28

BODDY, WILLIAM ARTHUR, Scarborough, Builder Scar-  
borough Pet March 27 Ord April 26

BRIDGLEY, TOM STOTT, Holmfirth, nr Huddersfield, Dyer  
Huddersfield Pet April 10 Ord April 27

EMOOK, EMMETT WILKINSON, Harrow, Grocer St Albans  
Pet March 13 Ord April 27

BUCKLEY, WALTER, Delph, Yorks, Grocer Oldham Pet  
April 26 Ord April 26

BURLEY, ARTHUR HARRISON, York York Pet April 26  
Ord April 26

CASTELL, WILLIAM THOMAS, Rivington st, Shoreditch,  
Packing Case Maker High Court Pet March 31 Ord  
April 28

FENNEY, THOMAS FRANCIS, Middleton one Row, Durham,  
Builder Stockton on Tees Pet April 26 Ord April 27

GLINDHILL, FREDERICK, Bradford Bradford Pet April 27  
Ord April 27

GORDON, ROBERT CHARLES, Stockton on Tees, Cartwright  
Stockton on Tees Pet April 26 Ord April 26

HARDING, WILLIAM GEORGE, Exeter, Baker Exeter Pet  
April 26 Ord April 26

KITCHEN, JAMES, Fulwood, nr Preston, Tailor Preston  
Pet April 19 Ord April 25

LEAH, WILLIAM HENRY, Prestwich, Lancs, Estate Agent  
Manchester Pet April 26 Ord April 26

LEVI, ABRAHAM, 64 Prescott st, Whitechapel, Tailor High  
Court Pet April 28 Ord April 28

MARSHALL, HARRY LEVETT, Hove, Sussex, Clerk, Brighton  
Pet March 23 Ord April 27

MUSGRAVE, GEORGE, Hattogate, Piano Dealer York Pet  
April 26 Ord April 26

PARDON, WALTER EDWIN, Stechford, Worcester, Fish  
Dealer Birmingham Pet April 24 Ord April 24

PHIPPS, FREDERICK FOXCOMBE Hill, Berks, Builder Oxford  
Pet April 5 Ord April 26

PIKE, CHARLES FREDERICK, Manchester, Calico Printer  
Manchester Pet April 10 Ord April 26

PINNEGAR, SAMUEL, Wotton under Edge, Glos, Plumber  
Gloucester Pet April 28 Ord April 28

PURCE, WILLIAM, son, Leobury, Hereford, House  
Decorator Worcester Pet April 27 Ord April 27

ROBERTS, SQUIRE, Liveredge, Yorks Dewsbury Pet  
March 29 Ord April 23

SMITH, SAMUEL, St Helen's, Lancs, Butcher Liverpool Pet  
April 26 Ord April 23

SPARROW, ARTHUR JAMES, Rayleigh, Essex, Butcher  
Chelmsford Pet April 27 Ord April 27

SPENCER, TOM WILLIAM, Brampton, Derby, Tailor Chester-  
field Pet April 26 Ord April 26

STOCK, CLIFFORD FRANCIS, Weston super Mare, Somerset,  
Coal Merchant Bridgwater Pet April 26 Ord  
April 26

THOMAS, WILLIAM, Briton Ferry, Glam, General Dealer  
Neath and Aberavon Pet April 23 Ord April 26

THORNEY, JOHN, Skelton in Cleveland, Yorks, Surgeon  
Stockton on Tees Pet April 27 Ord April 27

VAN LAUN, HENRY THODORE, St Helen's pl, Bishopegate  
st, Merchant High Court Pet Jan 24 Ord April 28

WARWICK, EDWARD, Birchfield, Handsworth, Tube Manu-  
facturer's Foreman Birmingham Pet April 24 Ord  
April 24

WATERS, FREDERICK GEORGE, Leeds, Electrician Leeds  
Pet April 23 Ord April 23

ADJUDICATION ANNULLED AND RECEIVING  
ORDER RESCINDING AND PETITION  
DISMISSED.

FINDLEY, CHORSE DELAPLAINE, Savoy st, Strand High  
Court Rec Ord Jan 20, 1905 Adjud May 13, 1905  
Rec, Annul, and Dis April 27

ORDER RESCINDING ADJUDICATION.

JONES, HENRY ROBERT, HM Prison, Wandsworth High  
Court Adjud Nov 16, 1905 Rec April 9

## MERRYWEATHER

On FIRE PROTECTION and WATER SUPPLY  
To COUNTRY MANSIONS, ESTATES, &c.



MERRYWEATHER, LONDON. No. 2382  
MERRYWEATHER'S "VALIANT" STEAM  
PUMP AT WORK.

The "VALIANT" is adapted for every kind of  
Pumping Work, including—

**Fire Protection,  
Water Supply to Houses and Farms,  
Watering Cattle,  
Pumping Out Ponds,  
Irrigating Land,  
Watering Lawns and Gardens,  
Washing Hops, Fruit Trees, &c., &c.**

**THE LIGHTEST AND MOST POWERFUL PUMP ON  
THE MARKET.**

Weight 6½ cwt. Simple in Construction.

AS SUPPLIED TO—

Earl Fitzhardinge. E. W. Harcourt, Esq.  
Lord Gifford. Earl Scarborough.  
Lord Pirbright. Baron F. de Rothschild.  
Sir Edward Malet (Monaco). Hon. D. Waring.  
Sidney Harrison, Esq., J.P. Sir Philip Egerton.  
Wilberforce Bryant, Esq. Miss A. de Rothschild.  
A. Mackenzie, Esq., &c., &c.

Write for Illustrated Pamphlet No. 829v.

**MERRYWEATHER & SONS, 63, LONG ACRE, W.C., LONDON,**  
FIRE ENGINE MAKERS TO H.M. THE KING.

### To Solicitors.

**THE NATIONAL SAFE DEPOSIT CO., LIMITED,**  
1, QUEEN VICTORIA STREET, E.C.

ESTABLISHED 1872.

Subscribed Capital - - - **£198,000.**

Is limited by its Memorandum of Association—

(1) To the letting of Safes and Vaults. (2) To performing the office of Trustee or Executor.

All Legal Work connected with Trusts or Executorships will be placed with the Solicitors introducing the same

Moderate Charges. Absolute Security.

No Financial or Speculative Business undertaken.

**SAVES AND STRONG ROOMS FROM £1 to £500 A YEAR.**

For further particulars apply to—

A. E. ORAM, Director-Manager.

**LAW.—Young Solicitor (admitted), 23,  
Final, April, 1906, Public School man, Desires  
Change; Midlands preferred, not essential; reference;  
small salary required.—Apply, A. C. J., Bath House, Lich-  
field-street, Hanley, Staffs.**

**MANAGING (or) Conveyancing Clerkship**  
Wanted; thorough town and country experience in  
Conveyancing, Executorship, Trust, Accounts, and all  
General Practice; painstaking and accurate; unsupervised  
if necessary; disengaged; unadmitted; married.—E., care  
of "Solicitors' Journal" Office, 27, Chancery-lane, W.C.

**TO SOLICITORS, GUARDIANS, and**  
Others.—Vacancy for a Male Patient mentally afflicted  
desiring a good home; every care and personal attention;  
twenty miles from London; healthy locality; only one case  
taken.—Apply, "F. B. G.," Rectory, Swanscombe, Green-  
hithe, Kent.

**LAW.—GREAT SALARY.—For prompt  
payment 25 per cent. will be taken off the following  
writing charges:—**

	s. d.
Abstracts Copied	0 8 per sheet.
Briefs and Drafts	0 2 3 per 20 folios.
Deeds Round Hand	0 2 per folio.
Deeds Abstracted	0 2 0 per sheet.
Full Copies	0 2 per folio.
PAPER.—Folioscop, 1d. per sheet; Draft, 4d. ditto	
Parchment, 1s. 6d. to 1s. 6d. per skin.	

KERR & LANHAM, 16, Farnival-street, Holborn, E.C.

**LAW BOOKS at GREAT REDUCTIONS!!**  
—All kinds of Law, Commercial, and other Books  
supplied. Mostly LATEST EDITIONS. State wants.  
Send for List. New Books at 25 per cent. Discount. Sent  
on approval. BOOKS BOUGHT.—W. A. FOTLE, Cecil-  
court, Charing Cross-road, W.C.

**SECOND-HAND BOOKS WANTED.—**  
Pollock's Contracts, Edward's Real Property, Under-  
hill's Torts, Harris' Criminal, Paget's Banking, Baldwin's  
Bankruptcy, Emery's District Council.—Write H., care of  
"Solicitors' Journal" Office, 27, Chancery-lane, W.C.

**TO LET, Two Offices (first floor), previously  
occupied by a Solicitor; good position; in same street  
are Police Court, County Court, Polytechnic, Public Library,  
several Solicitors, Architects, and Surveyors. District Sur-  
veyor, Surveyor of Taxes, &c.—Apply, Mr. H. O. THOMAS,  
A.M.L.C.E., Surveyor, 19, William-street, Woolwich, S.E.**

**LINCOLN'S INN FIELDS (close to).—**  
Excellent buildings, lately completed, TO BE LET for  
any business purpose, or would be divided into roomy  
Offices for first-class Solicitors.—Apply to Mr. P. E. T.  
THOMAS, 104, High Holborn, W.C.

**FREEHOLD PROPERTY, let on repairing  
lease for 7, 14, or 21 years at £1,000 per annum, to be  
Sold, situated in the immediate vicinity of Bond-street, and  
covering a large area; price £22,500, shewing 4½ per cent.  
clear; suitable for trustees.—Apply, MAX & ROWDEN, 39,  
Maddox-street, W.**

**LOANS ADVANCED at moderate interest  
on Freeholds and Long Leaseholds. The Mortgage  
Assurance Scheme is attractive, providing as it does for  
periodical extinction of the loan by moderate annual pay-  
ments.—Apply, MANAGERS, Star Life Assurance Society, 34,  
Moorgate-street.**

**WANTED. £2,500 Loan at 10 per cent. and  
Bonus on Property out of England, but owned in  
England; security same as accepted by a Colonial Bank.—  
Address, S., Box 7, care of Willings, 73, Knightsbridge,  
S.W.**

**WANTED. £7,000 at 4½ per Cent. on  
security of Brewery Premises of ample value.  
Also about £3,000 on Licensed House in good position; or  
£10,000 on two securities together; valuation if desired.—  
HERBERT DENISON, Solicitor, Leeds.**

**LONDON GAZETTE (published by authority) and  
LONDON and COUNTRY ADVERTISEMENT  
OFFICE.—No. 117, CHANCERY LANE, FLEET  
STREET, LONDON.**

**HENRY GREEN, Advertisement Agent,**  
begs to direct the attention of the Legal Profession  
to the advantages of his long experience of upwards of  
fifty years in the special insertion of all pro forma notices,  
&c., and to solicit their continued support.—N.B.  
Forms, Gratis, for Statutory Notices to Creditors and Dis-  
solutions of Partnership, with necessary Declaration.  
File of "London Gazette" kept for free reference. By  
appointment.

**THE LONDON and WESTMINSTER  
LOAN & DISCOUNT COMPANY (Ld.) (Est. 1856).  
Offices: 63, St. Martin's-lane, W.C., & 43, London wall, E.C.  
ADVANCE MONEY on personal security, furniture, leases,  
life policies, &c., repayable, INCLUDING INTEREST:—**

	£10 One Year,	Weekly	£20 4 4	Monthly	£20 10 0
£20	"	"	£20 12 6	"	£21 16 0
£20	"	"	£21 1 2	"	£24 13 0
£100	"	"	£22 2 4	"	£29 7 6

Larger sums in proportion. Moderate rates for bills of  
sale. Prospectus free on application to Secretary. (No  
Agents.)

# NORTHERN ASSURANCE COMPANY.

ESTABLISHED 1836.

London: 1, MOORGATE STREET  
Aberdeen: 1, UNION TERRACE

Accumulated Funds - £7,012,118.

The SEVENTIETH ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING of this Company was held within their house at Aberdeen on Wednesday, the 2nd May, 1906, when the Directors' Report was presented.

The following is a summary of the report referred to:—

## FIRE DEPARTMENT.

The PREMIUMS received last year amounted to £1,112,592, showing an increase of £22,339 in comparison with those of the previous year.

The LOSSES amounted to £533,918, or 48.0 per cent. of the premiums.

The EXPENSES OF MANAGEMENT (including commission to agents and charges of every kind) came to £301,781, or 35.2 per cent. of the premiums.

## LIFE DEPARTMENT.

ASSURANCE BRANCHES.—During the year 1,416 Policies were issued for new assurances, amounting in the aggregate to the sum of £234,212. These new assurances yielded annual premiums amounting to £19,718, and single premiums amounting to £274.

The TOTAL INCOME of the year from premiums was £275,807, and from interest £129,870.

The CLAIMS amounted to £262,626.

The EXPENSES OF MANAGEMENT (including commission) were limited, in the Life Accounts to 10 per cent., and in the Endowment Account to 5 per cent. of the premiums received.

ANNUITY BRANCH.—The sum of £101,399 was received for annuities granted during the year.

The whole FUNDS of the Life Department now amount to £4,608,010.

## QUINQUENNIAL INVESTIGATION.

The investigation into the Assurance and Endowment Branches has been made on the same stringent data as before, the rate of interest assumed being 2½ per cent. In the Participation Branch an additional sum has been reserved to make the valuation equivalent to one on a 2½ per cent. basis. In the Annuity Branch the new "British Offices' Tables" have been used, the rate of interest assumed being 3 per cent. as before.

In the Non-participation and Endowment Branches, the profits of which belong to the shareholders, the surplus is £29,071.

In the Participation Branch, the profits of which belong to the policy-holders, there is a surplus of £330,037.

In the Annuity Branch, the profit or loss on which is for the account of the shareholders, there is a deficiency of £12,833.

The report having been unanimously adopted, resolutions (amongst others) to the following effect were unanimously carried: That the sum of £37,500 be transferred from the Non-participation life and Endowment fund accounts to the purpose of paying in five yearly instalments a "Shareholders' Life Bonus" of £1 5s. per share, being 5s. payable in each of the years 1906 to 1910; that a further dividend of £2 and a bonus of 10s. per share be paid in respect of the year 1905 (making the total distribution for the year £2 15s. per share); and that a reversionary bonus of £1 11s. per cent. per annum be declared upon the original amounts assured by all policies in the Participation Branch current on 31st December last, for the five years ending that date, with a further prospective bonus, at the rate of £1 5s. per cent. per annum, upon all policies which shall become claims before 31st December, 1910.

## LONDON BOARD OF DIRECTORS.

Colonel Robert Baring, Esq.  
H. Cosmo O. Benson, Esq.  
Lawrence E. Chalmers, Esq.  
Ernest Chaplin, Esq.  
Alex. Haun Goschen, Esq.  
Henry Charles Hambro, Esq.

Wm. Egerton Hubbard, Esq.  
Frederick Huth Jackson, Esq.  
Henry James Lubbock, Esq.  
Charles James Lucas, Esq.  
Lt. Hon. Sir Algernon West, G.C.B.

SECRETARY—H. E. Wilson.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY—H. Gayford.

FIRE DEPARTMENT { J. Robertson, Home Superintendent.  
Jon. Fowler, Foreign Superintendent.

LIFE DEPARTMENT—H. Foot, Actuary.

GENERAL MANAGER OF THE COMPANY—H. E. Wilson.

Copies of the report, with the whole accounts of the Company for the year 1906, may be obtained from any of the Company's offices or agencies.

## LAW FIRE INSURANCE SOCIETY,

114, CHANCERY LANE, LONDON.

Notice is hereby given that the ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING of the above-named Society will be held at the Society's House, Chancery-lane, on Tuesday, the 8th day of May next, at One o'clock in the afternoon, for the purposes following:—

- (1) To receive and consider the Accounts of the Society and the Directors' and Auditor's Reports.
- (2) To elect Ten Directors in the room of the like number of Directors who go out of office.

The Directors retiring are:—

CHARLES WHITEHEAD GRAHAM, Esq.,  
LORD STRATHEDEN AND CAMPBELL,  
JOHN GWYNNE JAMES, Esq.,  
GEORGE EDGAR FRERE, Esq.,  
FREDERICK MORGAN, Esq.,  
WILLIAM MELMOTH WALTERS, Esq.,  
WILLIAM WILLIAMS, Esq.,  
FREDERIC PARKER MORRELL, Esq.,  
WILLIAM NOCTON, Esq.,  
SIR HENRY ARTHUR WHITE,

all of whom, being eligible, offer themselves for re-election.

- (3) To elect an Auditor of the Society's Accounts for the year ending at the General Meeting, 1907.
- (4) To transact any further ordinary business of the Society.

By order of the Board,

WILLIAM JOHN VINE, Secretary.

Dated 18th April, 1906.

N.B.—The Accounts of the Society, and the Auditor's Report upon them, may be inspected by Shareholders for 14 days previous to the Annual Meeting and during one month after it.

## LAW FIRE INSURANCE SOCIETY,

114, CHANCERY LANE, LONDON.

The TRANSFER BOOKS of the Society CLOSED from the 23rd April to the 9th May, inclusive.

By order of the Board,

WILLIAM JOHN VINE, Secretary.

## THE KING'S CORONER, being the Practice

and Procedure in his Judicial and Ministerial Capacities. By R. HENSLOWE WELLINGTON, Deputy Coroner City and Liberty of Westminster, and for the South-West Division of London; Barrister-at-Law. Pp. xvi.+148. Price 7s. 6d. net.

"Supplies accurate and useful information."

Irish Law Times.

LONDON: BAILLIÈRE, TINDALL, & COX, 8, Henrietta-street, Covent Garden.

## REEVES & TURNER, LAW BOOKSELLERS AND PUBLISHERS.

Libraries Valued or Purchased.

A Large Stock of Second-hand Reports and Text-books always on Sale.

3, Bream's Buildings, Chancery Lane, E.C., FORMERLY OF 100, CHANCERY LANE AND GARY STREET.

NOW READY. SECOND EDITION. Price 5s. net.

AN EPITOME OF THE  
PRACTICE of the CHANCERY and  
KING'S BENCH DIVISIONS  
OF THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE.  
By A. H. POOCK, Esq., Barrister-at-Law.

LONDON: EFFINGHAM WILSON, 54, Threadneedle-street, E.C.

## SPECIAL NOTICE.

THE KELLY LAW BOOK COMPANY, Limited, respectfully beg to remind their Customers and Friends that they supply ALL Legal Publications at Lowest Subscription Rates.

Also that they are prepared to make an Allowance for Superseded Editions by way of Part Payment.

THE KELLY LAW-BOOK COMPANY, Ltd.,  
Dealers in all Descriptions of Law Books,  
CAREY STREET, CHANCERY LANE, W.C.  
\* A List of Second-hand Practical Law Books, post-free.

## PLEASURE CRUISES TO NORWAY

BY THE

ORIENT COMPANY'S S.S. "OPHIR,"

6,814 Tons Reg., 10,000 H.P.

19th & 20th June. Visiting BERGEN, GUDVANGEN  
14th and BALHOLMEN, MUNDAL, LOEN,  
29th July. MEROK, NAES, and ODDE.

13 DAYS' delightful Cruise for  
13 GUINEAS and upwards.

Managers:

F. GREEN & CO.; ANDERSON, ANDERSON, & CO.  
Head Offices: FENCHURCH AVENUE, LONDON.

For Passage apply to the latter Firm at 5, Fenchurch-avenue, E.C.; or to the West End Branch Office, 28, Cockspur-street, S.W.

## THE REVERSIONARY INTEREST SOCIETY,

LIMITED

(ESTABLISHED 1823).

Purchase Reversionary Interests in Real and Personal Property, and Life Interests and Life Policies, and Advance Money upon these Securities.

Paid-up Share and Debenture Capital, £637,525.

The Society has moved from 17, King's Arms-yard to 30, COLEMAN STREET, E.C.

## EQUITABLE REVERSIONARY INTEREST SOCIETY, Limited.

10, LANCASTER PLACE, STRAND, W.C.

ESTABLISHED 1838. CAPITAL, £500,000.

Reversions and Life Interests in Landed or Funded Property or other Securities and Annuities PURCHASED at LOANS granted thereon.

Interest on Loans may be Capitalized.

C. H. CLAYTON, Joint  
F. H. CLAYTON, Secretaries.

## GENERAL REVERSIONARY AND INVESTMENT COMPANY, Limited.

No. 26 PALL MALL, LONDON, S.W.

Established 1836, and further empowered by Special Act of Parliament.

Share and Debenture Capital - £621,220.

REVERSIONS and LIFE POLICIES PURCHASED on favourable terms. LOANS on REVERSIONS granted either at annual interest or for deferred charges.

ROBERT R. TILT, F.I.A., Actuary and Secretary.

## 19th CENTURY BUILDING SOCIETY,

ADELAIDE PLACE, LONDON BRIDGE, E.C.

Assets - - - £162,000.

CHAIRMAN

SIR HENRY WALDEMAR LAWRENCE, BART., J.P.,  
2, Mitre-court-buildings, Temple, E.C.

Prompt and Liberal Advances to Purchase, Build, or Improve Freehold, Leasehold, or Copyhold Property.

Borrowers Interest 4 per cent. Monthly repayments, which include Principal, Premium, and Interest for each £100: 10 years, £1 1s. 1d.; 12 years, 18s. 6d.; 15 years, 15s. 6d.; 18 years, 14s. 2d.; 21 years, 12s. 11d. Survey Fee to £500, half-a-guinea.

Prospectus free of  
H. W. HEFFERMAN, Manager (pro. tem.).

## SUN FIRE OFFICE.

Founded 1710.

LAW COURTS BRANCH:

40, CHANCERY LANE, W.C.

A. W. COUSINS, District Manager.

FUNDS IN HAND - - £2,563,000.

## ALEXANDER & SHEPHEARD, LIMITED.

PRINTERS,

LAW AND PARLIAMENTARY.

PARLIAMENTARY BILLS, MINUTES OF EVIDENCE, BOOKS OF REFERENCE, STATEMENTS OF CLAIM, ANSWERS, &c., &c.

BOOKS, PAMPHLETS, MAGAZINES,  
NEWSPAPERS,

And all General and Commercial Work  
Every description of Printing.

Printers of THE SOLICITORS' JOURNAL  
and WEEKLY REPORTER.

NORWICH STREET, FETTER LANE, LONDON, E.C.



S. FISHER, 188, Strand.